DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 099 CS 200 282

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Burton, Dwight L., Ed. |
| TITLE | English Education Today: Selected Addresses Delivered at the NCTE Conference on English Education (Indiana University, March 28-30, 1963). |
| INSTITUTION | National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill. |
| PUB DATE | 63 |
| NOTE | 71p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Ill. 61801 (Stock No. 18206, $1.65 non-member, $1.50 member) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Composition (Literary); Curriculum Development; Educational Research; Educational Researchers; *English Curriculum; *English Education; English Instruction; Graduate Study; Language; *Liberal Arts; Literature; *Methods Courses; Methods Teachers; Professional Education; Research Methodology; Research Needs; Specialists; *Teacher Education |

ABSTRACT

Thirteen addresses from the 1963 Conference on English Education deal with problems faced by educators responsible for preparing prospective teachers of English. A brief introduction in which Dwight L. Burton affirms that teacher education is a sound blend of liberal arts and professional education precedes Robert C. Pooley's discussion of "The Scholarly and Professional Role of the Specialist in the Teaching of English." Methods courses in the teaching of English are defended, defined, and evaluated by George H. Henry, David Stryker, and Agnes V. Boner respectively. Major concepts in educational research to be taught to prospective teachers are presented by David H. Russell; and the responsibility and problems of the English education specialist in conducting and supervising research are discussed in papers by Margaret Early and John A. Brownell. Graduate studies and 5th-year programs in English education are considered by Stanley B. Kegler and Richard A. Meade. Lennox Grey develops a case for and against the three-component English Curriculum. The College Entrance Examination Board's 1962 Summer Institutes are evaluated by John C. Gerber, and the bulletin concludes with Dora V. Smith's "Comments and Reactions to the Conference." (This document previously announced as ED 023 682.) (SW)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 070049

# ENGLISH EDUCATION TODAY

Selected Addresses Delivered at the
NCTE CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION

Indiana University
March 28-30, 1963

DWIGHT L. BURTON
Editor

National Council of Teachers of English
508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois

CS 300 282

National Council of Teachers of English
COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

JAMES R. SQUIRE, NCTE Executive Secretary, Chairman

JARVIS E. BUSH, Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh

AUTREY NELL WILEY, Texas Woman's University

MIRIAM E. WILT, Temple University

ENID M. OLSON, NCTE Director of Publications

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Council of Teachers of English
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1963

National Council of Teachers of English

## PREFACE

In one sense English education ranges from the kindergartner learning a nursery rhyme to the doctoral candidate studying variant spellings in Elizabethan folios. In a much narrower meaning it refers to courses and activities which help to prepare the prospective teacher of English for his work in schools or colleges. It is with the more limited conception that the conference herein reported deals. A preliminary inquiry by the National Council of Teachers of English revealed that some 1,150 persons throughout the United States have, as part of their academic assignment, responsibility for students in "methods courses" in the teaching of English, sometimes in English departments, sometimes in education departments, and sometimes in cooperative arrangements between the two departments. Although the Council has always been concerned with English education in the broad sense, the Executive Committee felt that the time had come for a study of problems specifically focused on the preparation of teachers of English. This beneficial conference was the result.

Although the theme of the conference was limited by its planners, a wide variety of problems appeared within the boundaries set. Far from dealing only with a single methods course, the conference was concerned with such topics as requirements for the English major, graduate programs leading to master's and doctor's degrees, inservice education of English teachers, and the role of research in the teaching of English. Although the formal papers and the group discussions included these and other wide-ranging topics, the conference was marked by a singular freedom from discussion at cross purposes and a striking unity of concern. Part of the harmony and agreement was shown in the desire of the group to put the conference on some sort of permanent basis. This question is now under study by a committee appointed by the Council.

Each reader of this report will have his individual perceptions of its merits, its weaknesses, and its main implications, but it seems to me that there are several conclusions implicit in the pages which follow:

(1) The barrier between "academic" and "professional" courses breaks down when the larger purposes of teacher preparation are kept in the foreground.

(2) The demands on the prospective teacher of English are complex. He must have a solid background in English and American literature, know something about literatures in other languages, know how to develop the ability to compose, understand something of language and linguistics, be acquainted with the psychology of learning, be able to use instructional aids, and know a little perhaps about the teaching of reading, adolescent literature, and literary criticism.

(3) This formidable list of competences and knowledge of the English teacher suggests that not everything can be taught in preservice courses and experiences and that an important part of the English teacher's training lies in what happens after he begins to teach. This calls for the strengthening of institutes, master's programs, and other aids to professional excellence.

(4) The broader spectrum of English education includes not only preservice and inservice training but the study of the English curriculum and research approaches to problems of teaching and learning English. We have made only a start on the two enterprises, but this report indicates some next steps.

DAVID H. RUSSELL
President, National Council of Teachers of English

National Council of Teachers of English

## CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION

Indiana University, March 28-30, 1963

Program Chairman: DWIGHT L. BURTON, Florida State University

Local Chairman: INGRID M. STROM, Indiana University

Planning Committee Members:

WILLIAM H. EVANS, University of Illinois
M. AGNELLA GUNN, Boston University
WILLIAM E. HOTH, Wayne State University
SISTER MARY SYLVIA, Mt. St. Joseph Teachers College
R. C. SIMONINI, Longwood College
ROBERT F. HOGAN, Assistant Executive Secretary, NCTE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


PREFACE . . . . . 3
DAVID H. RUSSELL

INTRODUCTION . . . . . 9
DWIGHT L. BURTON

THE SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL ROLE OF THE SPECIALIST IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH . . . . . 11
ROBERT C. POOLEY

METHOD: THE NEW HOME OF THE LIBERAL SPIRIT . . . . . 19
GEORGE H. HENRY

THE "METHODS COURSE": ITS SCOPE . . . . . 25
DAVID STRYKER

AN EVALUATION OF A METHODS COURSE . . . . . 27
AGNES V. BONER

RESEARCH: A PRIORITY . . . . . 31
DAVID H. RUSSELL

THE ROLE OF THE ENGLISH EDUCATION SPECIALIST IN SUPERVISING AND CONDUCTING RESEARCH . . . . . 39
MARGARET EARLY

BECOMING THREE-STORY MEN . . . . . 43
JOHN A. BROWNELL

GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION . . . . . 47
STANLEY B. KEGLER

FIFTH-YEAR PROGRAMS FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS OF ENGLISH . . . . 51
RICHARD A. MEADE

THE 1962 CEEB SUMMER INSTITUTES: THEIR ACHIEVEMENT AND PROMISE 55
JOHN C. GERBER

THE CASE FOR AND AGAINST THE THREE-COMPONENT CURRICULUM IN ENGLISH . . . . . 65
LENNOX GREY

COMMENTS AND REACTIONS TO THE CONFERENCE . . . . . 71
DORA V. SMITH

CONFERENCE PROGRAM . . . . . 77




6

## INTRODUCTION

**Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University**

It is my great satisfaction to call this conference to order. It is not fatuous, I think, to say that in the history of the English teaching profession this is a significant moment. This is so not only because this is the first national conference on English education. More important, this conference is a symbol of the coming to maturity of thought about the English curriculum and the training of those who shape it in the schools of the nation.

Many of us here who are members of college or university faculties—whether our academic appointments are in English, education, or both—often may carry on rather lonely lives professionally as we perform in that limbo between full acceptance by either the "academicians" or the "educationists." But recent events have been good for our egos! Recently our existence was given official sanction by the organization of college and university department heads in English. That group had this to say at a conference at Allerton Park, Illinois, last December: "The teaching of English and research in teaching will profit from joint efforts of specialists in English, English education, psychology and other areas"; and: "Faculty members engaged in research in the teaching of English should be considered eligible for any reduction in teaching loads that is available for those engaged in literary or linguistic research, and the results should be evaluated by criteria comparable to those applied in literary and linguistic disciplines."[1]

There was much discussion at the Allerton Park Conference, also, of the need for doctoral programs to prepare specialists in English education. Yet, of course, such programs have long existed—initiated by leaders such as Dora V. Smith, Lou LaBrant, Helene Hartley, Robert C. Pooley—but they have been limited, in the main, to a few large universities. Shoddy bills of goods in the training of English teachers have been peddled by many colleges and universities, even by those in which the standards otherwise are high. The deficiencies in the preparation of English teachers publicized by the report, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*,[2] would not have demanded attention had sound English education programs been more widespread and had English education specialists been in greater supply, for leaders in English education have spearheaded efforts to institute better majors for prospective teachers, programs which include, for example, work not only in English and American literature but also in linguistics, written composition, the teaching of reading, world literature, and literature for adolescents.

The nature of the personnel attending this conference is evidence of a growing belief that the conflict between the liberal arts and professional education is a spurious one and that quality teacher education represents a sound blend of the liberal and professional components. Most of us here have recognized the need to steer a course between the Scylla of fealty to mediocrity and fuzzy

[1] *Proceedings of the Allerton Park Conference on Research in the Teaching of English*, December 2-4, 1962 (Urbana: Department of English, University of Illinois, 1963), p. 118.

[2] (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961).

opposition to definiteness and the Charybdis of desiccated pedantry and flinty scorn for all professional training as "vocational." We know that we not only teach children but that we teach children English. At the same time we know that the laws of learning cannot be repealed, that the facts of individual differences in language development cannot be controverted by departmental fiat, and that the attempt to evaluate and measure growth in English language and literature does not necessarily transform the incipient humanist into a barbarian quantifier.

During the Basic Issues Conferences of 1958, Issue No. 28 emerged in these words: "*What kind of training in teaching methods does the future secondary school English teacher need?* . . . It seems evident that much closer cooperation between departments of English and departments of Education is necessary if this issue is to be resolved." Your conference program, growing out of this issue, may give a rather full answer to the question. Most universally, perhaps, English education is known to involve courses in methods of teaching English. Because of the great interest in the methods course, a general session and two of the seven continuing discussion groups will be devoted to this topic. Graduate curriculum-building and instruction is another crucial aspect of English education. We have noted already the agreement on the need for doctoral programs. But we cannot neglect the master's level lest teachers in pursuit of the master's degree continue to accumulate a random collection of courses in English or in education which has little to do with enhanced professional qualification. A sound master's degree in English education should be the standard practitioner's degree for the high school teacher of English. The need for acceleration of research in the teaching of English recently has been emphasized widely in the profession, and of course English education has a major role in this effort. It is, perhaps, a key responsibility of the English education specialist to act as coordinator in the interdisciplinary research necessary in attacking problems in the teaching of English. Much more detailed answers to the question, "What is English education?" will be given by Professor Pooley and others.

The entire English teaching profession will be the better for this conference, I am sure. An exciting two and one-half days of history-making lie ahead of us!

# THE SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL ROLE OF THE SPECIALIST IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Robert C. Pooley, University of Wisconsin

I consider this gathering one of the most important events that have taken place in recent English professional life. It is highly significant that for the first time, those who by profession are responsible for the training of teachers of English and of the development of the English curriculum are gathered together in conference. I am deeply sensible of the honor done me in being asked to make this opening address. For all of my professional life I have been concerned with and have been enthusiastic about the preparation and training of teachers of English. No matter what particular university appointment I have held, this task has been uppermost in my interest. Therefore, I am appreciative of the opportunity to speak to you now, and if I do not do full justice to the occasion, it will not be from any lack of interest and desire.

I suppose most of us at one time or another have heard the cynical remark attributed to the late Bernard Shaw, "Those who cannot do, teach. Those who cannot teach, teach teachers." Even if there is some faint element of truth in this generalization, it is one of the most glittering of that class of generalizations which are said to glitter. It does, unfortunately, reflect to some degree a public attitude. In our society the person who is responsible for the preparation and the education of teachers is not looked upon with any great favor, nor accorded any distinction. This is really a remarkable circumstance, since it takes place in a culture in which education plays so significant a part. The American people established and have developed one of the loftiest and noblest theories of education the world has known, that of providing free public education to all children, no matter of what rank or class or of what financial level. This goal is not only for the common grades, but through high school and indeed today largely well into, if not through, college. This is a magnificient ideal, and we are annually coming closer toward achieving it. Yet those members of our civic body, including those who are here, who are responsible for the training and the development of the teachers who accomplish this ideal, do not in general enjoy the prestige and esteem which such a responsibility might seem to give them. The reasons for this lack of recognition are many and complex, and I shall not attempt to analyze them here.

The point that I would like to stress is that we require in our particular profession the same stimulus and strengthening of professional unity and integrity which have elevated other professions to a high place in social recognition. I would remind you that surgeons were once barbers, that in the eighteenth century the lawyer entered the mansion of his client through the servant's door and was kept waiting in an inferior room until the client deigned to see him, that the doctors of veterinary science once were farriers or hostlers, and that other professions which today hold status in our society at one time were low on the social ladder. We can profit from history and by examining the means by which other professions have brought themselves to

favorable social notice, and we can take steps to do the same. I shall come back to this point later in my talk.

### Educational Preparation of the Specialist

The topic assigned to me is the educational and professional status of the specialist in English education. I would like to discuss this topic under five heads, the first of which is the educational preparation of the man or woman who is to become a specialist in the training of the teachers of English. There is no question that one of the first educational requirements is a sound grounding in English itself. This means not only the ordinary major in English in undergraduate collegiate education, but it means also particular training in the English language itself and in the skills of English composition. Therefore, the undergraduate training of the future specialist should be as rich as possible in all aspects of English, and the candidate should show aptitude not only in the reading and interpretation of literature but also in the command of the English language in his own writing. He requires, furthermore, at the bachelor level, an introduction to the history and structure of English.

From this beginning the candidate in our profession should move forward to his graduate degrees. Here the path may divide: he may take his master's degree in English with a minor in education or he may take a master's degree in education with a minor in English. In either case he is responsible for familiarity with the basic elements of modern educational theory and practice, for a command of educational psychology, for knowledge of the history of education of the world and particularly the history of American education, and for some command of those techniques of education dealing with measurements and educational testing. Above all, he should develop for himself a sound and workable philosophy of education. This is approximately the level of the master's degree.

From this point on the candidate looks forward to his doctorate. To candidates now starting I would suggest taking this degree in English, partly because of the richness of the field and partly because of the status it gives them among English colleagues. This is not to say that a degree in education does not qualify the person to teach adequately in our field. It is, however, to the advantage of the candidate to have done a significant piece of research in English of such a nature as will lead to the publication of an article or book in some aspect of English or American literature or in the area of linguistics. But it is equally important that the candidate continue his study of education to be aware of the latest theory and practice and to be able to conduct and develop adequate research and practical projects in education in the school system or the college or university in which he is called upon to pursue his profession.

### Necessary Experience

The second consideration is experience. The candidate for English education will characteristically have shown leadership in his teens and twenties in the various activities of young people. He will have taught a Sunday School class, led a youth group in a church or neighborhood house, or become a leader

of boys and girls in recreational activities. The essential characteristics to emerge are a liking for young people and the capacity to lead. As he progresses in his own education, he will grasp opportunities to enlarge this experience, in student teaching or an apprenticeship or internship in a public or private school. Somewhere in the totality of his preparation he must have two or three years of active school teaching in the grades or high school. The programs of training for English education in some universities require a minimum of two years' full time engagement as a teacher in public or private schools. The significance of this experience is not to have put in time, but to have gathered such a background of experience with students in the school years as will enrich and validate his training of teachers to perform the same tasks themselves.

### Research Competence

The third consideration is research. To begin with, our candidate in English education will have devised and brought to a successful conclusion a piece of research connected with the teaching of English. Ideally this experience will have been so pleasant and professionally satisfying as to lead him to foresee a continuing series of investigations which will enlarge his own knowledge and will contribute to his growing reputation as a sound man in his field. Such experience of his own will induce him to keep abreast of the researches of others, so that he can claim an awareness of the latest research findings in the teaching of English and can arouse in his students a knowledge of research and a readiness to keep abreast of its findings.

As chairman of the Board of Trustees of the NCTE Research Foundation, allow me to intrude some pertinent remarks here. Among teachers of English by and large the concept of the nature of research is dim. The applications the Foundation has received for grants-in-aid are, in the first place, extremely few, considering that the Council boasts a membership of over 50,000 individual members. Second, those that come in show a naiveté it would be unkind to laugh at. Some teachers believe that a request to have funds to attend summer school constitutes research. In two years of publicized invitation, less than twelve applications have been received. Of these only one was in such form as to be granted outright; two others have been tentatively awarded funds pending their revision into properly structured research. Most striking is the fact that only one of the applications received has come from a person concerned with the training of teachers. It is possible that all such persons have applications in for larger grants from the U. S. Office of Education. It is also possible that some are doing little or nothing to promote research. I leave it to you to decide. But the evidence so far is overwhelming that only a few specialists in English education are actively conducting research, and it is manifest that the teachers they train do not know much about research in the teaching of English. Here is a condition this group can effectively undertake to improve.

### Recruitment of Teachers

My next point has to do with the recruitment of teachers. The statistics concerning the need for teachers are now in the public press and I need not enlarge on them. But there is a need beyond the claim of statistics; it is the

need for quality. The strength of the English program in many junior and senior high schools lies in the present continuance of one or two able teachers of high quality. When these teachers are removed by death or retirement, there are few of their stature to succeed them. It may not be true of all parts of the country, but I know it to be true of my own section: the young people who present themselves to be future English teachers are not generally of the first stratum of ability. There has been a slow but steady regression in the capacities of the candidates for English teaching. There are many reasons for this regression: economic, in low salaries; social, in the public attitude toward teachers; personal, in the refusal to perform the onerous and multitudinous tasks imposed on teachers; practical, in the ability to get better jobs with higher rewards. I cannot attempt to analyze and offer solutions to these causes of lowered quality. The situation is another evidence of the paradox with which I opened this talk: our society, which in theory places education at the top of its values, in practice permits economic starvation and social obloquy to stifle the ideal. My point is that so far as we in English education are a profession, we can utilize our corporate strength and wisdom to turn the tide. Specifically this means using every means available to change public attitudes toward the teacher of English as well as all other teachers; to fight for public support of education; and to begin a campaign of a conscious, organized nature to lead young people of high quality to enter English teaching as a profession. We have the same claim to dedicated public service as has the Peace Corps. What is needed is the public attitude to support the claim. On a higher level we must give more attention to the directing of able graduate students into the profession of English education. This means an active, conscious effort at reaching the right people in the upper undergraduate years. Too few able students now embarking upon advanced degrees in English know anything about the opportunities and rewards in our profession. There is a serious shortage of persons trained in the manner I have attempted to outline in this talk. The need for them is constantly increasing. Here is another challenging job for our profession to undertake.

### Needed Statesmanship

My fifth point has to do with the statesmanship required of the current specialist in English education. In an article not yet published, Professor John H. Fisher, secretary of the Modern Language Association, says, "It is no wonder that a curriculum and a profession of English education have grown up to mediate between the scholar and the teacher. We should all have different specialties. It is normal that some members of a department will be more interested in literary history, some in criticism, some in linguistics, and so on. Those who are interested in the teaching problems of the lower schools should have an equally honorable place in our departments."

These remarks sum up an attitude that is of very great current significance. Departments of English the country over are becoming increasingly aware of a neglected or unrecognized obligation, the obligation to be actively concerned about the teaching of English at all levels. They recognize that this means in practical terms that one or more members of the English department must be concerned with the teaching of English, and that these persons represent

a specialty of the English department on a par with literary history and criticism, linguistics, and English composition. Increasingly departments of English must think of themselves as a composite team of competent specialists each devoted to his own responsibility, but sharing the joint responsibility of advancing the skills and knowledge of English for all students from the kindergarten through the graduate school, and even beyond, in reaching the public through the media of extension classes, radio, and television. In so comprehensive and worthy an endeavor there is really no place for petty rivalries, internal divisions, and belittling of tasks. In some of our great universities such equality of task and honor has been true for many years. I think of Professor Hopkins of Kansas, Rollo L. Lyman of Chicago, Charles C. Fries of Michigan, Sterling A. Leonard of Wisconsin, and Charles Swain Thomas of Harvard as shining examples. There are some here today who enjoy similar standing and prestige. It is a time for true statesmanship to build solid unity between English and education.

### The Future

But let us admit that in the past the position of the specialist in English education has not always enjoyed the highest prestige. In part this has been the result of the inevitable linkage to professional education, an academic discipline, in the past at least, subject to misunderstanding, misevaluation, and manifest prejudice. If education has erred in unwise generalizations and the overenthusiastic promotion of fads, the liberal arts have erred equally in arrogant aloofness and haughty ignorance. But we are not concerned with whipping dead horses. I bring back the past only to emphasize the golden opportunity of the present. There has never before been so favorable a climate for the advancement of the profession of English education. Let me sum up the favorable trends. The National Council of Teachers of English is about to publish its volume on the training of teachers, to which distinguished professors of English have contributed. Next will come the final volume in its curriculum series on the teaching of college English. This volume is sponsored in addition by the Modern Language Association, the College English Association, and the American Studies Association. The book represents an effective working coalition of professors of literature and those concerned with the teaching of English, as is evidenced by its co-editors, John R. Gerber, past president of the NCTE, and John H. Fisher, current secretary of the MLA. Last December a meeting of chairmen of English departments was held under the leadership of Professor Robert Rogers of the University of Illinois, the stated purpose being to study ways of implementing research in the teaching of English by departments of English. From this gathering it appears that a continuing organization will develop. Earlier last year, in May, a meeting was held at Pittsburgh under the leadership of Professor Erwin Steinberg to explore the areas of needed research in the teaching of English. Among the participants were English department chairmen, professors of English education, school administrators, directors of teacher training, and professors of education. The report, which many of us have seen, is a mine of information for the pursuit of specific research in the teaching of English. Add to these incentives the Project English of the U. S.

Office of Education, which is encouraging and liberally supporting sound research in the teaching of English, and you find an impetus unparalleled in past experience to advance the knowledge, the practice, and the prestige of those concerned with the teaching of English and the training of teachers of English. This gathering is, in effect, a focus of these influences; from this meeting it is proper to expect much.

What should we expect from this meeting? First, I would suggest, a clarification of our aims, a better understanding of our field of endeavor, and a sharpening of emphasis upon those problems which claim first attention. The program lying ahead of us these next days contains addresses, panels, and discussions to accomplish this purpose. A second purpose, I venture to suggest, is the exchange of ideas, views, and specific practices. We have, of necessity, to work in relative isolation. Many of us are unique in our positions; in the midst of many professors of literature and linguistics, we stand somewhat apart; in the midst of professors of education our subject specialty sets us apart. But here we meet in accord and affinity, bound together in aim and practice by our devotion to the advancement of English education. Professional enrichment will be the outcome of our exchange of fundamental values, our recognition of the major tasks ahead, and our exchange of specific methods of accomplishing these tasks.

### A New Organization?

A third value to derive from this meeting is the consciousness of our professional unity and the creation of a structure to insure its continuance. I would like to develop this point rather fully, as I suggested above. We are united, in one sense, in the National Council of Teachers of English, our parent organization, whose organizational machinery established this gathering. I would be the last person to suggest any weakening of our ties to that organization and all that it has come to stand for. With equal reluctance I face the prospect of suggesting the formation of another organization in these days of multiplied organization. Yet there are aims to be clarified which are strictly the concern of those here today; there are standards to be established for professional training which are our particular problem; there is that delicate matter of the formation of professional status leading to prestige which concerns us in a peculiar and personal way. With the best will in the world no major and all-inclusive membership such as that of the NCTE can accomplish these goals for us, nor can we, lost among a membership of seventy thousand, find the coherence to advance our peculiar needs. I find myself driven by circumstances to recommend some kind of organization to guarantee the perpetuation of the purposes for which we are here assembled.

I suggest, therefore, within the structure of the National Council of Teachers of English, the foundation of a guild or fellowship of specialists in English education. Membership in this guild would rest upon prior membership in the NCTE. In this relationship we have the precedent of the CCCC, to which many of us also belong. But unlike the CCCC, our purpose would be not so much the advancement of a particular aspect of the teaching of English as the creation of singleness of purpose and the corporate action of a professional group. Its

distinct purpose is unification and identification of a scattered and amorphous professional group. By uniting, we can discover for ourselves and make known to others what we are, who we are, and what we stand for. We can delineate the obligations and privileges which derive from our act of association. We can specify the qualifications for admission to our fellowship. Above all, we can present a professional solidarity, combined with freedom of ideas, to our colleagues in English and education. The values of such an association and the good that it can accomplish for English education are sufficient, in my view, to overcome the reluctance with which I suggest another organization.

In conclusion, I trust I may be permitted to recommend that before this gathering is dismissed an occasion be found to elect an organizational committee to consider the steps to be taken to form a guild, fellowship, or whatever structure may be deemed best, and to submit such proposals to a special section meeting of this group at the next convention of the National Council of Teachers of English at San Francisco in November of this year.

15

A1

# METHOD: THE NEW HOME OF THE LIBERAL SPIRIT

George H. Henry, University of Delaware

Today a profound change is sweeping over the whole field of teacher education, and few either in the over-splintered liberal arts schools or even in schools of education are aware that courses in education may be destined to play the leading role among the liberal disciplines in the near future. It looks as if the declining liberal arts themselves are likely to be saved by the new spirit, attitude, method, and content coming into these courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.[1]

A few weeks ago, as consultant to an English department, I was explaining how the study of a grammatical element could be immediately related to building better sentences. Previously, I had shown how to tie together logic and composition. One of the teachers broke in with this observation: "You know, the scope and sequence we are preparing, this articulation we now hear so much about, this allocation by grade business that we have spent dozens of hours on, are *all* we have left for our trouble. The little asides on method you have been giving us are far more important, yet they won't get into the guide or syllabus." Another teacher added: "This syllabus, as much as we like it, can be sterile and unproductive under one method, and alive and fruitful by another method. What we need, really, is a guide to method." What both teachers meant is that the courses we were creating were *all content and little form.*

There isn't a humanist who does not harp upon the interplay of form and content in a work of art. John Ciardi sometime ago went so far as to speak of "form as the kind of experience that goes most deeply into whatever a man is. Dance, ritual, religious ceremony, political ceremony, or poetic encounter—." No wonder the critic places great emphasis upon the sustained metaphor as form in Donne or in a Shakespearean sonnet, or the chorus as form in a Greek play, or the sentence that houses simultaneous experiences in a Joyce novel. Implied in the relation of form and substance is the deeper one of art and life which, at bottom, is man's innate desire to impress a mold, an order, upon the miscellaneous array of sensations and happenings that flood upon him every waking moment year in and year out. This union of form and theme becomes an experience.

Teaching too is an art. It too inescapably has its form and its substance. A course is a momentary order impressed upon the heritage as it tumbles down to us from all the centuries and places in all kinds of literary types. A course, by the proper union of form and content, becomes the discipline a teacher must

[1] By a decline in the humanities I do not mean a loss in members to schools of business and engineering, etc. I mean a decay within—a helplessness before a necessary revision of courses, the lapse into techno-professionalism, a lighthearted disregard of the humanities as human experience in favor of the humanities as conventional curriculum. Note Mr. Sizer in The Twenty-nine College Cooperative Plan: *The Academic Preparation of Secondary School Teachers, 1962:* "Another problem . . . was the disorder in the structure of their various disciplines and the confusion this leaves in both secondary school and college curricula."

submit to that he might turn this heritage into an experience. A course must therefore have a beginning and an end, a source of unity, a progression. It is a design made to bring more humanity to a living being, which is to say, to help a youth press a form on his own developing being: an English course is a design by which great writers are used to order experience.

Now what a paradox that many who take extreme pains to explicate the form of a masterpiece often to the point of preciosity will vehemently refuse to examine their own method, which is the form of their course. This willful know-nothingism about the art of teaching, as if what one knows is enough to teach by, is in part a denial of the human, for it rejects the idea that teaching, like all other arts, needs a form, a method. A writer, it appears, must submit to a method of composing, while a teacher, to many humanists, need not! In truth, many humanists would be indignant about the study of the form that a course should take. In the 1820's Fichte pointed out that the average German professor would be embarrassed were he asked to present a systematic and comprehensive view of his subject. Socrates once said that the unexamined life is not worth living. Humanists, it appears, are exempt from examining their own teaching. To teach one's dissertation is liberal; to defend why one teaches it is vocational! Even a golfer looks to his form.

### Demands on Students in Methods

Year after year, when I face a new crop of prospective English teachers in my methods course—by the way, I receive the cream of the university in scholarship—I am confronted by the results of this know-nothingism. I have to spend days with them investigating what English *is* and what it is *for*. After four years of majoring they seem unable to tell what they hope to do with English. Now J. B. Priestley and Archibald MacLeish, which I give students to read, do not find it beneath themselves to ask such a question, but English departments seem to take this for granted. Through *The Education of Henry Adams* and *Of Human Bondage* I show how the humanities have been taught and why Progressive Education came into being, and they are surprised to learn that in the 1890's classicists like Kitteridge and Gummere had their troubles framing a course in English for high schools, writing "that grammar should not be regarded as a special subject and pupils should not be made to write themes merely for the sake of showing their ability to write." I am bold enough to maintain that this kind of inquiry is liberal education, for it is the study of what form, what discipline, has historically controlled the art of teaching English.

Another demand I make of students of method is this: Before you teach a work of art you must ask yourself as teacher how you would conceptualize it, what levels of meaning are inherent in it. If you don't do this for yourself, or if you rely on the textbook questions to do it for you, your teaching will be pointless, a dormitory bull session. Yearly, the majority in the class exclaim in reply how difficult this task is, because the professors have generally been doing this *for* them. For once they are on their own and must sink or swim by their own intellectual analysis. I ask them, "How would you make 'My Last Duchess' an experience in the Ciardi sense? How would you plant one

foot in life and one in 'L'Allegro,' as MacLeish advises? Is it possible to teach American literature, writer by writer, with the result that pupils still have no notion of the Puritan tradition and its decline? In teaching British literature, where would you tread lightly and what would you omit and why? Justify what you would preserve? Is such a survey valid?" Again, I maintain this is a liberating intellectual experience. Method here is conceived as the form of the art of teaching. These questions raise some of the deepest issues in the assimilation of the heritage by the young.

### Technique versus Method

I once heard a regional director of Great Books, Inc., initiate a Great Books "course." A disclaimer of methods courses, he proceeded to say that the Great Books were to be conducted by dialogue, by the Socratic method. I suspect that he thought that since the method was ancient and was associated with an established teacher he could refer to that illiberal word "method." The Great Books as a list, of course, won't teach themselves. Since Socrates' time a great deal has been uncovered about group discussion, but, to the director, to go into all this would be a sordid technical business unworthy of a Great Books discussion. But why has all method stopped since the Fourth Century, B. C.? Any study of Socrates' method reveals its gross limitations despite its good points. A liberally educated man, it seems to me, is aware of the alternatives within group discussion, of the possibilities in organizing the Great Books, and what ways are at hand to make a Great Book an experience. Since Whitehead has moved us all away from facts and substance to process and event, and Dewey has reminded us that means is inherent in the end, just how can method, which includes "process" and "means" as continuous instead of static in form, be thought of as "merely" technical and applied? There is a great deal of difference between the humanities and what is selected from them to be walled into courses. In truth the humanities, put up in the form of courses, greatly suffer because departments cannot come to grips with the form of general education. Thus, the humanists of the curriculum variety are embarrassed by the creative act of poetry, as if creation is inferior to talking about it. They are regretful of Shakespeare as playwright, preferring not to look at his poetry to be staged and voiced. They would decline prodding into a way of reaching freshmen as too practical.

In art, all method has embedded within it subdevices we call techniques. Method, larger than technique, is a study of the fitness of form to content; how a change in intent alters the organization of means, how new forms are sought to contain the interpretation of new conditions. English cannot avoid the technical, the anapest, the terza rima, sprung rhythm, and for that reason English too can become vocational when these are studied for themselves without considering the larger form they create. In my methods course, it is rare that I take up such matters as voice projection, use of blackboard, walking around the room to change the center of interest, and so on; and when I do, I think of them only as techniques creating a larger form, as I would if I were pointing out how a caesura or an alliteration makes the wing of an Emily Dickinson

lyric flight. The methods course is liberal when the prospective teacher must decide which pattern of ideas to be taught is the best of the several known to be possible, in light of a certain kind of experience to be sustained, and in light of the total effect which is the aim of the course.

Abundant illustrations of how even the liberal course itself can degenerate into the technical are offered by Gilbert Highet in his *The Classical Tradition*. He quotes Nichols Murray Butler: ". . . I recall that during the first term of the sophomore year we were to read with Dr. Drisler the *Medea* of Euripides and that when the term came to an end we had completed 246 lines . . . we never came to know . . . the significance of the story or the quality of its literary art. . . ." And E. F. Benson writes, "The methods of tutors resembled that of those who, by making their pupils chop up dry faggots of wood, hoped to teach them what was the nature of the trees that once the wind made murmurous on the hillsides of Attica." In both cases method has turned technical. No course in itself is either liberal or technical. Content without method is not art; method without content is not art.

Those who disdain method courses usually beg the question by putting an adjective before liberal. They speak of "sound" liberal courses, which of course implies that there are unsound ones. How can one tell the difference between "sound" and "unsound" except by method? Or they refer to "solid" liberal subjects. Or very often they sidestep method by treating it parenthetically. Listen to Mr. Fadiman at Miami; he said, "A great work of art, properly taught, performs work on the teenager; and—this is what somehow he must be taught to feel—." Notice the phrase "properly taught" and the little adverb "somehow." How naively vague for such an undertaking! A methods course is concerned with this "properly taught," this "somehow."

Mr. Donald Adams of the *Times*, speaking of twentieth century criticism, laments "that the champions of the exclusively cerebral approach to literature have largely taken over the . . . teaching of poetry in our colleges." On the other hand, Robert Spiller is now cheered by the fact that at last "literary scholars have turned to the creative processes as a living act and the work of art as an object to be freshly experienced. . . ." Methods courses have been forged from these two poles of thought for years. How, in a class full of lower middle class youth, can we avoid the unduly cerebral and turn the work into a fresh experience? But the methods course operates with this larger difference. Both Adams and Spiller need only write about the condition; the methods teacher must do something about it with people; he must literally try to mediate "Ode to a Grecian Urn" into a fresh experience for the devotees of Elvis Presley and the victims of Madison Avenue's snares. When one only writes about it in the *Times* and in the *Saturday Review* one is supposed to be engaged with the "truly" liberal; but when one seeks a method of reaching youth, one is only practicing an applied art, and hence is automatically second-rate. A dean from Michigan State brings us the insight that not only published books but graduates too are bearers of the liberal heritage. In truth, the heritage exists only when, assimilated by a human being, it influences him at a moment of decision.

## Method and Unity of Knowledge

No apologies are needed for the method course, for those who teach it are in the company of Plato, Aristophanes, Quintilian, Petrarch, Rabelais, More, Whitehead, and Russell. Twenty years ago T. S. Eliot wrote that "The task of education is no longer the task of merely training individuals in and for society—but also the larger task of training society itself. The scope of education has been rapidly expanding as social organisms have broken down. . . ." This task, I repeat, is the task of method.

With the vast explosion of knowledge at hand, the liberal arts must ask where English belongs in the new attempts at the unity of knowledge. In Mr. Russell Thomas's new book *The Search for a Common Learning*—he is a professor of humanities—note the place of method: "It is only for analytical purposes, of course, that these factors [educational principles, administrative structures, and pedagogical methods] can be separated. In practice they are inseparably bound." The liberal arts must ask, too, how shall English fit into an increasingly nonreligious, secular, non-Western world? How English should relate itself to the reality that mathematical physics is unfolding. How English should be related to the bottom of the barrel in the social order. To frame such questions as these is the meaning of method. In this sense method is inseparable from liberal.

Method is larger than mere devices for provoking discussions, tricks of gaining interest, and ways of making subject matter stick; it is more than passing on the methodology of research. A hundred years ago Herbert, sensing the defects in German scholarship, stated the case for method as it is now being explored in a liberal way in our schools of education: "The modern problem is not how to compose history but how to utilize for educational purposes that which has been composed." The study of education as a process inherent in the larger social-historical process is the method of liberal education.

Here is the cardinal issue of our times: In what way and to what extent was education responsible for the debacle of this century of the common man that began with such high hopes? For over a century schools of education have undertaken this task almost entirely alone because a tradition of specialized, technical study within the liberal arts relegated more and more to education courses this responsibility and, according to Ortega y Gasset and C. P. Snow, thereby forfeited their humanity. Today, as a result, the liberal spirit, so long in decline, is being revived once again—this time not in ancient languages, not in science, not in theology, not in the new social sciences, but in the task of finding a method of mass liberal education in a value-torn civilization.

# THE METHODS COURSE: ITS SCOPE

**David Stryker, University of Florida**

After a quarter of a century of teaching, I claim to be doing a few things better now than when I first began teaching. Having tried different approaches to solving the problems that inevitably come up in a one-semester course in the teaching of English in the secondary school, I have settled upon four goals that I think the methods course should aim to accomplish. I am aware of the objections: You are trying to cover too much; you expect too much from inexperienced undergraduates; there isn't time; you should work on fundamentals. In the presence of a roomful of veterans who wrote the very books and articles that I have learned by, I submit that these *are* the fundamentals on which a beginning teacher can build a career that will satisfy himself and those he serves.

1. *Acquaint the student teacher with professional publications.* Require that he read in, take notes on, and react to five kinds of professional publications: (a) Current textbooks on the teaching of English. Let him read a chapter here, a chapter there, in a half-dozen different texts, to find out what the experts have to say on the same topic. (b) Learned journals, including the *English Journal* and *College English*. Make sure he has held in his hands and read at least one whole article from such useful publications as the aforementioned, as well as the *Seventeenth-Century Newsletter, Victorian Studies,* and *American Speech.* (c) State and local curriculum guides and courses of study. The teacher of the methods course can easily accumulate a supply of single copies of dozens of these publications, for study, comparison, criticism, use. (d) Pertinent popular magazines like *Theatre Arts, Saturday Review, New York Times Book Review,* which contain articles about books and authors. (e) Books written especially for adolescent readers. Every prospective teacher of secondary students should read one modern novel aimed at teenage boys, another at teenage girls, and he should be familiar with lists of scores of such stories expressly written for young people.

2. *Inculcate a professional attitude.* By precept and example, the teacher of the methods course advocates (a) Membership in county, state, and national professional organizations. (b) Attendance at and participation in meetings of these organizations. The teacher goes, takes his students with him when possible, and talks candidly with his class about his own involvement, who was there, who said what, what happened. (c) Participation in school, county, or national committee work. The methods course appropriately alerts the student to an awareness of the teacher's responsibilities at home and at large in professional work that is not always directly connected with his subject field.

3. *Inform regarding current research and practice in eight areas.* Obviously a one-semester course can only touch upon the work that is going on in these eight crucial areas. Even a week on each can open a student's eyes to vistas he must continue to peer into: (a) Organizing instruction, (b) Language, (c)

Literature, (d) Reading, (e) Writing, (f) Speaking, (g) Grouping for instruction, (h) Articulation.

4. *Provide practice in constructing a practical theme-centered unit.* Such a unit should involve all the language arts and might include use of (a) Adopted textbooks on literature and composition, (b) Library resources, (c) Audiovisual materials, (d) Community resources, (e) Integration with other subject fields, (f) A particular, known school and class—in the student's former high school or in the one where he hopes to intern.

I have named four areas in which I am convinced the student must have experience before he leaves college, if he is to feel equal to student teaching and employment in school systems which may or may not encourage him—or allow him—to become a good teacher of English for midtwentieth century Americans.

# AN EVALUATION OF A METHODS COURSE

**Agnes V. Boner, Montana State University**

As the member of a department of English who is charged with teaching "English (Ed.) 481. Methods of Teaching Secondary School English," I am particularly aware of the criticism of courses in education. No footnote is needed; the reader may find such articles—serious, comic, thoughtful, or shallow—in the latest issues of popular or professional magazines.

Courses in methods of teaching specific subjects have suffered few attacks in print. Oral disparagements are heard, however, especially from professors of academic subjects: "You learn to teach from experience." "You can't tell anyone else how to teach." "They would be better off taking more subject matter." Under this bombardment in speech and print, I finally decided to put to a test the course offered at Montana State University, and the study described herein was born.

## Background

Courses in the teaching of secondary school English have increased in popularity since the beginning of the century. In 1901, only four of thirteen prominent institutions whose catalogues I examined offered the course.[1] In 1910, the catalogues of nine of thirteen universities and five of thirteen colleges selected at random listed it. In 1913, twenty-one of twenty-four universities reporting to the Commissioner of Education were giving methods.[2] After an exhaustive survey, James Hosic wrote in 1916 that English methods was taught in all the larger universities and colleges especially in the summer.[3] Today most institutions training teachers offer methods,[4] and the course is generally recommended by groups studying teacher education.[5]

At Montana State University, methods is offered during the winter and summer quarters for four credits. Students are expected to take it before practice teaching, but because of scheduling problems many of them take it later.

## Procedure

A questionnaire was sent to all ex-students who had taken the course during the previous three years. The response was about 85 percent, or 60 returns. After 14 returns were discarded because people were not teaching high school English, the evaluating group equaled 46.

---

[1] These were the English departments of Dartmouth College, Howard University, and the state universities of Michigan and Oregon.

[2] Report of the Commissioner of Education (Washington: Bureau of Education, 1913), p. 520.

[3] National Council of Teachers of English, Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting, *English Journal*, V (1916), 59.

[4] This writer found that in the Northwest Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools there were, in 1958, only three institutions of over 400 students which did not include a course in methods of teaching English.

[5] National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, *Curriculum Programs* (Washington: National Education Association, 1959), pp. 20-21.

Part I of the questionnaire asked the teachers to pass judgment on the value of the course as a whole; Part II asked them to rate each lecture-discussion, demonstration, and assignment as to its usefulness in preparing them for teaching situations; Part III asked them to check from a list of items those which they thought should be added to the course; Part IV asked them to list parts of the course which should be emphasized more and the parts which could be omitted without loss; finally they were invited to comment freely.

### Results

In Part I raters were asked to check one of three statements which best described the value of the course as a whole. Thirty-two checked "very helpful," 12 checked "fairly helpful," and 2 checked "not helpful."

They were next instructed to check the most useful phase of the course. Fourteen checked "The lectures and discussions," 25 checked "The demonstrations of teaching methods and techniques," 24 checked "The written assignments," and 7 checked "The readings assigned in textbooks, professional books, and professional magazines." Although it is obvious that many raters checked two or three items instead of one as directed, the results show a preference for demonstrations and practical assignments. A comment from one teacher is representative of others on this part of the questionnaire: "I liked the demonstrations of teaching grammar and motivating reading. I have used over and over your steps in teaching poetry, speech, and composition."

Part II of the questionnaire listed the main lecture-discussions, demonstrations, and assignments of the course and asked teachers to rate them as follows:

"A" if it gave you insight into teaching methods and techniques which you actually adapted for use in teaching.
"B" if it gave you useful knowledge as a background for teaching.
"C" if it was not useful to you, or not applicable to high school teaching.

The demonstrations, lasting from ten to twenty minutes, were given by me or by class members to supplement the lectures and discussions. More than half the teachers rated the demonstrations listed below "A":

Correcting students' themes so that you teach individuals
Helping students solve problems involved in a writing assignment
Motivating independent reading
Teaching poetry, plays, novels
The traditional versus the functional method of teaching grammar
Teaching usage by the oral method

Several raters suggested more demonstrations. Said one, "Lectures about experiments in methodology and on factual material could be replaced by more demonstrations of teaching techniques." On the other hand, only 12 teachers thought that observation of routine teaching in the public schools (there is no campus school) should be added. Since observation was a prerequisite for practice teaching, it had not been included in methods. The results of this part and the teachers' comments indicated that demonstrations given by the professor were more highly regarded than those given by students.

Rated "A" by more than half the teachers were these assignments:

To plan a composition lesson from the assignment to the final draft
To read student themes, suggest revisions, and point out errors
To plan a unit integrating the study of literature, composition, and speech
To plan a lesson integrating grammar with composition
To plan a speech project

Although unit planning was called very helpful by 31 people, several reported that they found unit teaching troublesome, unsuccessful, or impossible. Said one rater, "Units are difficult to execute for these reasons: Lack of prior preparation on the students' part, lack of time for planning, and the extremely wide range of individual differences within a single class."

All of the assignments rated "C" (not helpful) 8 or more times had to do with tasks not needed by the teacher in his actual conduct of the class period:

To examine standardized tests in reading and language and select several for future use
To write a composition of the kind you will ask your students to write
To examine and comment on professional books

Only five of the 21 lecture-discussion combinations were rated "A" by more than half of the teachers; all five dealt with what and how to teach:

The various plans for organizing the course in high school English
What shall be our objectives in teaching writing? What kind of writing assignments will help reach the objectives? (Group reports)
Descriptions of studies made by George Norvell and others concerning the interests of children in literature
What usage items to emphasize and why (including mimeographed material)
The steps in planning and teaching a project in speech

Five other lectures rated not helpful by 8 or more were those aimed at giving students a background of information which might help them gain a better understanding of high school English:

What is effective communication? (round-table discussion)
Descriptions of experiments made to test the "intensive" versus the "extensive" method of teaching literature
History of the attitude of the schools towards grammar and "correct" usage
Theories of teaching spelling

The other eleven lectures were rated "B" by 9 to 22 people. The lecture-discussions were, as a whole, regarded as less useful than the assignments and demonstrations.

*Concern about grammar.* Much worry and frustration over the teaching of grammar was evident. Twenty-three teachers commented that they often consulted their class notes regarding grammar, 17 believed that grammar should

be emphasized more, and 5 stated that the real source of the trouble was that teachers did not know grammar. The wail, "How can you make grammar more interesting?" was reiterated.

*Interest in poetry.* Teachers seemed to fear that they were less successful at teaching poetry than other literature. Eleven teachers mentioned that they had used their notes on teaching poetry; 5 others thought that poetry should receive more emphasis.

*Proposed additions.* Instruction in the technique of improving reading ability should be added, according to 38 of the 46 raters. Such instruction had been omitted to avoid duplicating a course in the school of education. "Organizing and supervising extracurricular activities" was checked 18 times, and "standards for judging textbooks" was checked 17 times.

## Summary

1. A majority of a group of 46 experienced teachers rated the methods course they had taken as students "very helpful."

2. They approved most highly of the instruction in the techniques of teaching and the making of lesson plans; they were less enthusiastic about the lectures and discussions designed to help them arrive at a philosophy of teaching, to give them an understanding of the place of English in the curriculum, and to give them a background necessary for intelligent selection of teaching materials. The written comments as well as answers to the questionnaire indicated that teachers expected a methods course to tell them *how* and *what* to teach in the high schools as they are now constituted.

3. They showed more concern about the teaching of grammar and poetry than about any other phase of the course.

4. About 82 percent recommended that the teaching of reading be added to the course.

## Conclusion

The judgments and comments of the evaluating group furnished the teacher of this course new insight into student desires and additional knowledge of conditions in today's schools. A revision of the course followed.

Several results should be of enough interest to warrant further study by college and university departments educating teachers of English.

1. What should be the specific function of methods courses in the total preparation program?

2. Is the teaching of reading in the secondary school the pressing problem that this study indicates? If it is, can enough instruction be given in methods, or should students be required or encouraged to take a separate course?

3. Why is there so much anxiety and concern regarding the teaching of grammar? Are secondary schools overemphasizing grammar? Is the root of the trouble that teachers do not understand the structure of the English language? Have the teachers who complain that the teaching of grammar is difficult had any study of the English language as such? How much and what kind of study in the English language should be required of prospective teachers?

## RESEARCH: A PRIORITY

**David H. Russell, University of California, Berkeley**

In the Spring 1963 issue of *The American Scholar*, Mr. Jacques Barzun uses his favorite epithet when he labels linguistics as an example of *scientism*. He says further, "The issue comes down to this: Are the products of the human mind (in this instance, language) to be treated like natural objects?" However eloquently and eruditely Mr. Barzun puts his answer, some of us are a little tired of black and white labelling, of dividing human knowledge into science and nonscience, of saying that experimental methods of investigation apply to one field of study but not to another. It is my thesis not only that many aspects of verbal behavior are amenable to scientific investigation, but that it is high time we get busy combining literary scholarship with some of the experimental approaches of psychology and other disciplines. It is high time we had more facts about the teaching of English whether derived from literary scholarship, psychological research, or, even better, a combination of the two approaches.

My assumption, accordingly, is one which a few of you have heard me state before: Teaching is an art, and good teaching is a great art, but more and more it is an art influenced by scientific investigation. How can we develop this concept with a group of young people who, as English majors, are acquainted with some aspects of literary scholarship but who are soon to be mightily involved in the learning processes of 30 children or 150 teenagers? How can we help these teachers-to-be or teachers-in-service to find a basis for their teaching which includes but goes beyond literary history? Can we move people from a central concern with literary genres, the new criticism, William Blake, or Emily Dickinson to seeing their problem in terms of individual differences among adolescents, how one learns to write a decent paragraph, and the development of a permanent habit of reading good books?

### The Place of Educational Research

Before attempting to answer such hard questions, may I generalize about the role of educational or psychological research for a few minutes? What is its place in the total educational enterprise? What do we know about its strengths and weaknesses?

In advocating priority to research on teaching English, I am not implying that all problems of English or literary scholarship can be tackled this way. In a recent paper Northrop Frye suggested that there are three concerns in the study of literature: (1) the theory of literature—which is the domain of criticism, (2) the practice of literature—or learning to write for oneself (usually not accomplished in university classes), and (3) the teaching and learning of literature and language—which has not always been the concern of university departments of English. It is this third area for which I am especially recommending the empirical, "scientific" methods of research, although they may be applicable to the first two fields as well.

These methods for studying the teaching and learning of English are not new. They are based on the formulation of the scientific method by Francis Bacon. They usually attempt to deal with observable language behavior in speaking, writing, spelling, appreciation of literature, and other phenomena. They go beyond the intuitive thinking and rational analysis of the literary scholar to some form of testing hypotheses and verifying conclusions. They also lead to the discovery of new problems and new solutions.

Although research on educational issues such as learning and teaching is gaining in strength, it is still far from achieving the organized attack on problems characteristic of the natural sciences or even some of the social sciences. This may be partly because education is an applied field which draws upon a wide variety of research in genetics, anthropology, psychology, and other disciplines. It may be because teaching as a field of inquiry in its own right is only about 60 years old. Credit for the first educational study which might be labelled "scientific" is usually given to J. M. Rice, a school superintendent who in 1897 published an account of children's achievement in spelling. Incidentally, he found that elementary school pupils who devoted only 15 minutes a day to studying words did just as well in spelling as those who spent 45 minutes a day, and therefore he urged that pupils' time not be wasted unnecessarily. By 1915 some forms of educational research were established in certain institutions of higher learning and in a few school systems. Some of the claims made for research in the 1920's have never been realized, but in the last decade a small boom in such research has been developing.

Although considerable factual knowledge about educational problems has been accumulated, especially in the last 20 or 30 years, its applications in teaching are frequently limited. The place of research findings in educational decisions made by a teacher, a school board, or a community is often uncertain because of the complexity of factors influencing schools and teaching. The curriculum in a local elementary or secondary school is a product of many forces—among them traditions, legal requirements, philosophies of education, and parents' goals for their children. Somewhat more immediately, social pressures may affect our schools. If a group of parents or school patrons want more basketball or more marching bands or more science or more emphasis on college preparatory courses, and want them strongly enough, they can influence the school board, school officials, and teachers to move in these directions. But along with these forces, teachers and other school people are beginning to be influenced by scientific research on childhood and adolescence and on teaching and learning.

### Current Developments in Educational Research

What is this emerging educational research, and how is it being conducted? Definitions of research range from Charles Kettering's industrial view of research as "an organized method of keeping you reasonably dissatisfied with what you have" to Harold Laski's "a state of resentful coma in which professors sometimes find themselves." Studies labelled as educational research seem to range almost as widely as these definitions, for they may draw from

psychology, anthropology, biology, and many other fields. Education has been described technically as "an applied social science" and therefore finds data and methods in these and other disciplines. Careful studies of schools and pupils are usually more like research in psychology or sociology than like experiments in chemistry or physiology, so the label placing them with the social sciences seems reasonably accurate.

Although valuable educational research has been accomplished by psychologists, anthropologists, and other scholars, there is in addition a body of accumulated material and method originating with teachers, children, and adolescents, in classrooms or schools, which may be labelled "educational research." At present it is moving ahead on at least six fronts. Some research is done by committees of professional organizations such as groups of teachers interested in the teaching of English or mathematics. Second, some of the larger school systems such as the cities of New York, Detroit, and Los Angeles, and states such as New York, Michigan, and California have research bureaus working on local or state problems. Third, individual researchers such as university professors and their graduate students continue to publish valuable, if sometimes disconnected, studies as they have done since 1915.

But there are at least three more recent influences which have stimulated the production and communication of educational research. Industrial and commercial organizations are increasingly concerned with upgrading employee competence and have been looking for better methods of doing this, such as in the use of teaching machines. Other organizations producing psychological tests have large research staffs. A fifth stimulus to educational research has come from some foundations such as the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which two years ago gave over seven million dollars to educational institutions, most of it for research and development. The Fund for the Advancement of Education has supported demonstration and experimental programs in such areas as teacher preparation, curriculum improvement, studies in higher education, and the use of new resources in teaching. The Russell Sage Foundation reports that the nation's 5,212 foundations gave some 250 million dollars to education last year, a considerable part of which was earmarked for research.

Another recent influence on educational research is the federal government. It has long supported studies in certain enterprises such as vocational education, but more recently the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has contributed direct aid to educational research, some of it under the National Institute for Mental Health at Bethesda and more recently under the National Defense Education Act.

The three traditional and the three newer approaches combine to produce the current upsurge in educational research.

### Five Concepts to Be Developed

With this reawakening of interest in the scientific study of teaching problems, how shall we make the result of such research activity a priority in our own thinking and in the development of teaching competence in our students? How can we help them see that research gives some basis for dealing with those difficult problems I mentioned earlier—individual differences, socioeconomic

variations in language, learning to write, and development of permanent habits of reading? Some students, scornful of "methods" courses or resentful of "education" classes, will resist what to them is a new approach—at least in the first weeks of class seminars or meetings. I believe, however, that emphasis upon an established body of research not only will have intellectual respectability for them, but will gradually begin to function in their thinking.

Here, then, are five concepts about research which may be gradually developed over a semester. Time permits me to enlarge on only one of these, and you all may wish to add to the list as you work with your own students:

(1) *Research has now become an integral part of the total educational enterprise.* As I suggested above, it is only about 60 years old, and there are many gaps in our knowledge. Furthermore, until recent years research in education has been an infinitesimal part of our annual 25 billion dollar budget for education, particularly in comparison to big business and industrial corporations where research may be allocated from four to ten percent of the annual budget. Educational research is small in comparison but becoming ever more influential.

(2) *There are three kinds of operation or three functions in the total research process.* The first of these is the function of the discovery of new knowledge, usually associated with what we call basic research but, in our field, not unknown to the gifted teacher. Research studies by Judd and Buswell on eye movements in reading or Thorndike on word frequency were attempts to get at knowledge for its own sake. The second operation is the application of basic knowledge to technology, instrumentation, and practice—what we usually call applied research. The studies of eye movments were applied in reading, science, history, and other subject matter. Thorndike's work led to a large group of applied studies on simplifying vocabulary and on readability. The third function is that of innovation and dissemination—actually trying out the new ideas or materials, getting schools or school systems to undertake something new, overcoming the lag between what we know and what we do. The nuclear physicist to the electrical engineer to the man who repairs your transistor radio; the chemist to the pharmacologist to the doctor who works with the patient; in English teaching, for example, the scholar in linguistics to the doctoral candidate making a careful study of three bases for teaching grammar to the textbook writer or teacher of English composition. All three have functions to perform in relation to research.

(3) *There are some well-established ways of studying research for oneself.* I believe that every student in a course on the teaching of English should learn "how to do it oneself." He should become acquainted with (a) some of the standard research references and (b) some current research reports on a topic which interests him. Perhaps all of you here have your students learn to use such library resources as the *Education Index*, the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, the *Review of Educational Research*, and the new *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. I hope that all of you encourage your students to read not only summaries of research but a few current, primary sources in the *English Journal*, the *School Review*, the *Journal of Educational Research*, or

other periodicals. Such library skills may be the beginning of permanent habits of reading and of utilizing "the research point of view."

(4) *The best way to develop "a research point of view" is to try some informal experimentation oneself.* All of you have read about what we call "action research" or "operations research"—little studies in a particular classroom, school system, or college which probably have no wider application, but may stimulate both teachers and students engaged in something fresh and different. For class purposes some of you may not call this research, but it can be the "case method" or "problem solving" if you wish. You use it when you pose a question such as what to do in a school with an inadequate library and a group of tenth graders who read at about the third to sixth grade level. The attack on such problems is the first step in planning an "action research" project. Your own approaches to problems of a college class may illustrate willingness to try out and evaluate new procedures.

(5) *Finally, there are three main classes of research studies which students should recognize.* To some of you this is arrant oversimplification, for there are many variations in research design and commission. I believe, however, that identification of three main types can help both student and instructor in assessing strength and weaknesses of a study and in applying it to one's own work. The three kinds of research are usually labelled *survey* studies, *correlational* studies, and *experimental* studies. If we are beginning to study a problem for the first time, the first approach is usually discussion—we argue merits pro and con, perhaps for months or years, without doing much about it. English teachers often love to debate, and it is hard to move them sometimes from an opinion-basis to a fact-basis. Sooner or later, however, someone will say "Let's find out the facts." For example, we may argue whether or not linguistics is used in teaching English in California or Indiana high schools and whether it is a good thing. Research begins to enter the picture when we try to find out, by questionnaire or interview probably, what teachers say they do about linguistics. The report *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* is a good example of a survey of national conditions.

But to return to the linguistics problem, after the survey results are in, someone will say "O.K., 34 percent of our English teachers use linguistics, but is it a good thing?" We could get their opinions from a questionnaire but perhaps we want to dig deeper. Here is the place for the correlational study. Does some knowledge of linguistics make for better writing? Or again, is better reading ability in the eleventh grade associated largely with verbal intelligence, or can it be improved by a special two months' course? What things go together? A correlational study cannot ordinarily suggest causation; it can tell what things are usually joined or combined in some way.

If there is some indication from a correlational study that work in linguistics is associated with competent writing, the worker in applied research may want to consolidate proof and develop insights into possible relationships. If he can, he may set up an experimental situation in which he carefully tries to control such variables as student competence and intelligence, teachers' abilities, amount of writing done, etc., and then find out, over a year to two, whether instruction in linguistics is any better than traditional grammar or

generative grammar or the usage approach in developing better writing abilities. All these conditions are hard to control experimentally—which is often a reason educational research is a bit unsatisfactory. Only the experimental approach, however, can give us some of the deeper answers we want to many problems of teaching English.

### A Case Example: Teacher Load

This hierarchy of three approaches to a problem has been nicely illustrated in the last annual meetings and other activities of the National Council of Teachers of English. For some years there has been a vigorous discussion on teaching load in the Directors' and business meetings of the organization. In 1956 and 1957 the Council passed resolutions on the problem, and in 1958 passed another resolution reaffirming a recommendation of a maximum teaching load of four classes per day for high school teachers, or twelve semester hours for college instructors with enrollment limited to not more than 25 students per class.

Now this resolution may illustrate a worthy position and be an excellent stand to take in relation to public interest in the secondary school or college class. From a strictly scientific point of view, however, we have no evidence that 100 students is the proper teacher load or cutting point in high schools. Some teachers may be better in large groups, some read compositions faster, some are better able to concentrate on one or two composition abilities being practiced, some have heavy outside demands on their time—a hundred factors may affect the decision of what to do about teacher load. Recently the Committee on Research of the Council took the matter under study and did several things. First, it pointed out that careful studies of teacher load in English had been made—that there were some 170 references and perhaps 30 or 40 worthy studies of the question going back at least to Dora V. Smith's investigation reported in her doctoral dissertation.

The first step, accordingly, for anyone interested in the problem was to learn what was already known about it. (Incidentally, the Council is preparing such a summary with the help of Professor Ingrid Strom, and this will be available to Directors of the Council and other interested persons.)

Second, the Research Committee pointed out that the question of teacher load could be considered a part of the general question of how English teachers spend their time, in and out of school. A survey study using questions on many activities would have the advantage of not singling out for special notice the number of students taught or amount of time spent reading compositions. The questionnaire or interview schedule would have to be checked for ambiguity in questions and simplicity in tabulation. Decisions would be needed on what kind of a sample population should be studied.

Third, the Research Committee analyzed some of the subquestions under teacher load to illustrate the complexity of the problem. The analysis showed conclusively that there is no single or simple-minded answer to problems of teacher load which involve such factors as number and length of compositions assigned, ways of marking, amount of revision required, class size, and a dozen other factors. Depending upon the kinds of facts wanted, the Committee

proposed at least three kinds of researches other than surveys—case studies, comparative investigations, and experimental researches with careful control of all but one or two variables. For each of these approaches, a careful research design and help from design and statistical experts would be necessary. If anything like a national sample of students was involved, half a million dollars might be needed for the study or a series of related studies.

The point to the above sample analysis is not that we are ignorant of problems of teacher load in English. We have intuitively suggested a maximum of 100 students in four high school periods. Rather, we need to go beyond our best guesses to get the facts and to test our hypotheses. Most of us here should be able to take an intelligent position on the question of load, to go beyond surmise to some knowledge of the complexities of a problem facing all teachers. Because questions of fact are involved, empirical research must be used to give us some of the answers we need.

Some school people are like nurserymen with a new hybrid. They want to get the new idea into commercial production right away. The researcher, on the contrary, wants to take time to produce the hybrid in the first place, and then he wants to give it a careful tryout under controlled conditions. Careful research in teaching, as in other areas, is, in the words of C. P. Snow, "a self-correcting system. There is no fraud (or honest mistake) which is going to stay undetected for long . . . criticism is inherent in the process itself." The research worker does not want the teacher to acquire what Martin Mayer called "a superstitious belief in the juju of educational research." He wants to move the teacher from being a "passive purveyor of pedagogical platitudes" to a person who occasionally engages in Santayana's "invincible surmise."

# THE ROLE OF THE ENGLISH EDUCATION SPECIALIST IN SUPERVISING AND CONDUCTING RESEARCH

**Margaret Early, Syracuse University***

What is the role of the English education specialist in supervising research? The question implies that a major responsibility of the English education specialist who teaches in a graduate school is to direct doctoral research related to the teaching of English. In order to do so, he must understand the functions and limitations of research, particularly of the kind that can be conducted by the unsubsidized graduate student. If research is not to be limited by shortness of time and money and lack of personnel, the English education specialist may need to extend his role to seeking financial support for research ideas that may also generate doctoral studies.

The English education specialist should know what questions need to be asked about English—how language skills and appreciation of literature may be learned, how they may be taught, and how the curriculum may be organized. This implies a knowledge of what research has been done in the field and an ability to read research. The English education specialist should know what we most want to know in order to improve our understanding of English and the teaching of English, and he should also know what research methods can be applied to find valid answers. His knowledge of research methods probably cannot be as technical as that of the expert in statistics and research design, but he must understand these at least well enough to seek help from statisticians and psychologists. If he cannot use the researcher's tools directly himself, he must know their force so that he will not be dazzled by statistics and thus fail to detect unanswered questions which the outward display of accuracy can often conceal.

The English education specialist must have a philosophy of research. Perhaps the word itself has become too overworked ever to regain a common, precise definition. Most of us would recognize degrees of elasticity in the definitions of doctoral research and some latitude in the types of research we would accept or reject at this level. Perhaps this is largely a personal matter, or an institutional one; at any rate it seems unlikely that the quality of doctoral research can be legislated. The responsibility of the English education specialist to his profession is to maintain standards he respects; his reponsibility to his students is to make these standards known. Certainly it is the prerogative of the individual professor to reject, for example, historical surveys or studies of current practices. But for the individual or institution that maintains rigid definitions of research, it would seem to be a correlative responsibility to recognize the values of other kinds of thinking, the "powers of the left hand," in Jerome Bruner's phrase.

* In preparing this initial discussion of a few of the ideas implicit in the topic assigned to the group on research, I have drawn from preliminary correspondence with the consultants: John S. Simmons, co-chairman; Oscar Haugh, John Brownell, and Lou LaBrant. Although Dr. LaBrant was unable to attend the conference, she contributed many of the ideas contained in this paper.

In supervising doctoral research, then, the English education specialist must be able to define his particular standards of research, must know the existing research and the needed, and must understand the tests to which researchable questions can be put. To serve well this phase of his total role, he needs an analytical mind and sound judgment, but more than this he needs the tolerance to accept, and the enthusiasm to respond to, the ideas of his students.

### Purposes of Doctoral Research

What are the purposes of original research in the preparation of English education specialists? Some of the reasons for doing one good piece of research as a doctoral dissertation have been suggested in the foregoing; obviously the English education specialist needs this experience himself in order to guide others. But even if the doctoral candidate is not to become a teacher in a graduate school, the dissertation has values. One of these is to teach that the first step is to find out what is already known. It is easy for the would-be researcher to raise questions about teaching English. He soon learns that others have asked the same questions, and that perhaps a few have even found answers. The search which precedes defining a doctoral study gives the student the historical perspective that sometimes seems lacking when questions such as the relationship between knowledge of grammar and ability in written composition keep recurring in educational circles.

Another reason for doctoral research is to teach the student how to raise researchable questions and how to cut these to the limitations imposed by time, funds, and energy. As a result, the student learns how narrow the focus of doctoral research generally is and how limited the findings of shoestring studies must be. The object is not to humble the student (although this sometimes seems to be the unfortunate effect of the doctoral process), but to enlarge his vision of the demands upon educational research and to increase his care as a consumer of research findings.

Still another purpose of the doctoral study is to teach the investigator to distinguish between findings and conclusions. An astute advisor leads the candidate to measure accurately the distance between what is found and what is inferred. From reading his own data, as well as from studying the research experiences of others, the successful student learns to avoid familiar pitfalls: the Hawthorne effect, the failure to distinguish between correlations and causal relationships, the temptation to go beyond one's data.[1] If he is fortunate and wise, he learns that the true significance of his study may be what he learned of research method in doing it, and not the findings themselves.

From exercising caution in interpreting his findings, he learns to ask exacting questions about the conclusions reached by other researchers. For example, if the findings of a study of the use of lay readers, or machines, or special methods of instruction show that students "did better or no better," he learns to ask: "No better than what? Better in what way?" If experimental methods result in improvements in reading, he asks: "How improved?

[1] See Desmond L. Cook, "The Hawthorne Effect in Educational Research," *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 1962, pp. 116-122.

Did the subjects merely make better scores on a test, or did they begin to read more books? Or did they show marked improvement in courses that require reading?''

### The "So What?" Test

Early in the game, the doctoral candidate and his advisor must face the ''so what?'' question. This is not wholly answered by the benefits that accrue to the investigator in carrying out the study. Even though the research of a single investigator is necessarily limited, the study should be derived from carefully conceived theory. Otherwise, in the words of Edgar Dale, the study may prove only that we can do better what should not have been done at all. Many questions are not truly researchable, even though a design can be found to test them, because they arise from unsound premises. The role of research is to verify assumptions that are worth verifying.

The ''so what?'' test helps to define what our questions really ask. For instance, to ask teachers their opinions of anthologies may tell us something about the teachers but very little about anthologies. A content analysis made by a competent, open-minded critic would be a better source of information about what anthologies *are*, but it would tell nothing about what they *do*. The essential question may not refer to anthologies at all, since our interest as educators is not so much in how literature is packaged but in the effects of literature upon readers.

So important to the aims of teaching are ''effects of literature'' that the host of questions contained therein would undoubtedly satisfy the most rigorous applications of ''so what?'' But which of these are researchable? Some questions belong to speculation and theory, to introspection and intuition. Research design could probably handle only a small corner of the total fabric of ideas implied in ''effects of literature.'' A researchable question might emerge if we could define and delimit ''literature'' and ''effects'' and ''readers''—for example: how do adolescent boys of certain characteristics respond to selections of humorous verse under certain circumstances?

In the process of snipping off a manageable corner of an important idea, the investigator sometimes loses sight of the total fabric. So does his audience. Snippets of research depreciate rapidly when viewed out of context.

So the synthesis of sound research findings is a major responsibility of the English education specialist, one that he passes along to his doctoral candidate through the writing of the dissertation and the resulting publications. For unless the subject is so esoteric or the findings so limited as to defy interpretation, the investigator has an obligation to publish. In publishing the results of a new piece of research, the writer should clearly show its relationship to other studies. In addition to this type of synthesis, we need critical reviews and syntheses of research that serve to keep alive studies of value and to kill off those that have lost their usefulness. These periodic syntheses are useful contributions of the English education specialist to the improvement of his profession.

Learning to report research accurately is a major purpose of the doctoral program. The obligation to publish carries with it a responsibility to state

clearly and simply the results of the study. Moreover, the report should show how the results were obtained, giving full and accurate descriptions of the instruments of the study. In many instances the words to describe elaborate statistical treatment might be better spent on testifying to the quality of the data and the procedures for collecting it. While different audiences demand different levels of specificity in reporting research studies, the best report is probably the one that speaks simply and clearly to teachers of English and to nonspecialists, rather than to special coteries of psychologists, linguists, or statisticians.

For many English education specialists, opportunities to engage directly in postdoctoral research will be restricted by various demands upon their time and energy and interests: teaching, consulting, writing, administering programs, preparing instructional materials, serving local and national committees, guiding masters and doctoral candidates, etc. The English education specialist may choose not to conduct original research studies himself, but he cannot reject his obligations as a consumer and interpreter of research. His knowledge of research must inform all his other activities, becoming an integral part of his methods courses and his work with preservice and inservice teachers. Knowledge of research—what it tells and what it conceals—is essential to his theories of curriculum, teaching, and instructional materials.

With complete respect for research and its limitations, the English education specialist is too sophisticated to become a cultist. He knows better than to ask more of educational research than it can give in its present underdeveloped state. Similarly, he knows better than to turn his back on data carefully collected and recorded over the years, and still viable.

# BECOMING THREE-STORY MEN

**John A. Brownell, Claremont Graduate School**

This conference on English education and the focus of this particular group on research indicate that the professor of English or education who keeps one foot in English and one foot in pedagogy has emerged. If he is to secure his place in the world of scholarship, he must both value and be adept at inquiry. If he is to contribute to a definition of the discipline of English, help devise a school curriculum which is true to the nature of the discipline, prepare novices to teach in accord with its concepts and methods of inquiry, supervise graduate research, and exemplify the veteran at work at his craft, he faces some major difficulties.

Let me mention three. First, he must undertake types of inquiry in which most English departments heretofore have had limited interest. Second, he requires knowledge in a domain with which most education departments are only casually acquainted. As he proceeds, he will likely become aware of the limitations of both departments. Third, he confronts the paucity of theory models without which he will probably be unable to develop precise general theories of English. His major difficulty is not scarcity of research—there are several thousand studies in the area of reading alone—not want of research problems, not unavailability of research techniques. His major difficulty is that inquiry in English has not been pulled together into a unified theory structure. Without such theory, facts and generalizations lack relevance, predictions about the unobserved are impossible, and explanations cannot be warranted.

Oliver Wendell Holmes put the case this way: "The recording of facts is one of the tasks of science, one of the steps toward truth; but it is not the whole of science. There are one-story intellects, two-story intellects, and three-story intellects with sky lights. All fact collectors, who have no aims beyond their facts, are one-story men. Two-story men compare, reason, and generalize, using the labors of the fact collectors as well as their own. Three-story men idealize, imagine, and predict. Their best illumination comes from above, through the sky light." If the analogy is suitable, to improve students, teachers, curricula, and research, our first task in interrelating English and education is to become theorists, three-story men.

## Necessary Questions

To move in this direction, I believe that we need to ask radical questions about English, that is, those questions which go to the root of the matter. What do we most want to know about English and its teaching? What research designs and methodologies could answer these questions? If we found answers, what could we do with them? And could these questions and answers stand the brutal riposte, "So what?"

I should like to know some things that others may already know to their satisfaction. What is the domain of English? If we do not know clearly its nature, which includes not only what it is but also what it is not, then how can we know when one is a practitioner of his subject and when he is not? Without

a clear knowledge of what English is, how can we know whether a question is relevant to the subject or not? How can we know what kind of evidence is and is not relevant to a problem? What kind of evidence is relevant to the demonstration of the truth of what kind of propositions about English? What are the rules by which truths about English are determined? Do these rules differ if one comes to English through a literary tradition rather than out of anthropology or psychology to linguistics and thence to English? Are these traditions so different, even incompatible, that literature and language are in reality best considered separate domains? Can we be clearer about English if we know what some of the characteristics of other disciplines are?

Is English like physics? That is, does English content consist of logically related general statements? In physics, laws rest upon definitions and postulates that give rise to theories from which new laws can be deduced and tested experimentally. Theory is the connection between empirical propositions and postulates. The predictive capacity of the discipline is high; the explanatory power of the physical approaches universality.

Is English more like history? That is, does English content consist of particular statements rather than general ones, temporal statements and relations rather than logical ones, and evaluative statements which do not establish the truth of propositions?

Is English like mathematics? Northrop Frye suggests in *Design for Learning* that literature bears some resemblance inasmuch as literature is a deductively organized study and, therefore, should be studied deductively.[1] But does English have as its object number, quantity, metric, universal form? And has Frye given thought to the value modern mathematicians place in heuristic approaches?

Is English a fine art or a technological art? Is its chief value aesthetic, or is it instrumental as in the production of some artifact? Whether a fine or technological art, how does the intellectual element enter in?

In what sense are the objectives of the study of English determined by the conceptual structure and modes of inquiry of the discipline? Have we underestimated the defining power of object, content, and methods of inquiry upon objectives? Some philosophers have suggested that we have.

More narrowly, I am curious about how children can grasp and apply a knowledge of metaphor. How and when can we teach metaphor inductively? What intrinsic factors make a book difficult to read? Certainly vocabulary level, sentence length, sentence pattern do not explain difficulty in fiction. Quantitative reading formulas are really not much help in deciding reading difficulty in works of fiction because the formulas have no way of accounting for figurative language. How, then, can we assess difficulty in fiction?

### Development of Curriculum Theory

Suppose we consider the immediate problem of reforming the English curriculum. Can we expect to develop a theory of the English curriculum which gives a systematic account of the field and is derived from a set of general

[1] *The Language of Education* (Springfield, Ill.: C. C. Thomas, 1960).

propositions about English and pedagogy? Yes, but only if general theories of English and pedagogy were available, for, I would argue, a theory of curriculum for a discipline ought to be in harmony with the way we know that discipline. Let me for the moment assume the prerequisites and proceed with an analysis of a theory of curriculum suggested by Professor George A. Beauchamp of Northwestern. If we had a curriculum theory for English, it would consist of a set of related statements arranged to give functional meaning to the whole series of events which comprise the teaching and study of English. Such a set of statements would give greater meaning to the individual parts and foster interrelationships among the parts. This structure, dominated by the general character of the whole, would extend meaning to the set of events we had chosen to include. The statements could take the form of descriptive or functional definitions, assumptions, postulates, hypotheses, generalizations, as long as they were all related. What was included in the statements would be dictated by the scope proposed, the amount of empirical knowledge available, and the degree of sophistication of theory and research surrounding the elements included in the series of curriculum events.

If we set about to build theory according to this explanation of what curriculum theory contains, and I hasten to add there are many other possible explanations, what would we do? First, we would develop careful definitions of technical terminology and use the terminology consistently throughout the theory. Certainly recent studies in language illustrate this point. The level of definition I have in mind is best exemplified in Ryle's works, Smith and Ennis' *Language and Concepts in Education*,[2] or Israel Scheffler's *The Language of Education*.[3]

Second, we would arrange some scheme for classifying the existing knowledge about the English curriculum. Hopefully we would develop categories which have relationship with one another according to pre-established criteria; that is, we would build a taxonomy. The selection of horizontal sorting factors to use in this classification scheme would be crucial. About thirty years ago some attempted to classify the English curriculum by the "language arts" categories of reading, writing, speaking, listening. To classify thus was to establish a horizontal sorting factor of skill or function. Such a classification did not reflect a conceptual structure of English nor did it order English by its modes of making new knowledge. It was an instrumental classification.

In classifying existing knowledge of the English curriculum we would account for the current concepts and ways of knowing in the discipline and for knowledge from other disciplines such as philosophy, psychology, sociology which help in understanding human enterprises. Based on our previous experience in curriculum planning, we would include our knowledge of operations and procedures. And certainly we would account for such design elements as the selection of concepts to be included, the ordering of the concepts in such a way as to account for the mode of inquiry in English, and the choice of specific approaches to various concepts. From this classification scheme we would quite

---

[2] *Language and Concepts in Education* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960).

[3] *The Language of Education* (Springfield, Ill.: C. C. Thomas, 1960).

naturally develop a statement of a theory model, that is, a tentative set of statements which give meaning to the whole English curriculum; point up the relationship of its elements; and direct its development, use, and evaluation. The function of this model would be to provide a structure for making general theories of the English curriculum. The model would include our assumptions, definitions, design for planning, prescriptions for the curriculum design, general organization for instructional guides, and plan for evaluation of the curriculum. Inasmuch as classifiers would differ, models would vary.

In the third step in building a theory, we would make inferences or predictions beyond what we currently know about English. Herein would be the real test of the maturity of our theory: prediction. Testing inferences would lead us to a host of research problems, but each would now be related clearly to some larger configuration of ideas. Actually curriculum research at this time is far below the level of testing predictions. It is rather nearer the level of yielding hypotheses. Predictions lie ahead.

If we could proceed through the first four stages, we would arrive at the building of subtheories of procedure, content selection and arrangement, evaluation, teacher preparation, organization of English faculties, appropriate buildings and equipment, and requisite materials.

The greatest advantage of this concern for theory is that it yields practice, and practice in turn supplies information for modification of theory. As Schopenhauer said, "What is right in theory must work in practice; and, if it does not, there is a mistake in theory; something has been overlooked and not allowed for; and, consequently, what is wrong in practice is wrong in theory too."

For the person concerned with supervising and conducting research in interfield programs in English and education no single problem seems to require greater attention than that of developing an adequate theory for the curriculum and teaching of English. Let us turn our minds and energies to models which provide a structure for making theories; let us become three-story men.

## GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH EDUCATION

**Stanley B. Kegler, University of Minnesota**

An analysis of the history of education in this country reveals a number of developments which can be cited as turning points in the teaching of English. Each of these has had its impact on the schools and a reciprocal effect on teacher preparation programs; each has had its effect, in turn, on the kinds of graduate programs which were developed for advanced students. I should like to limit myself in the few minutes I have this morning to several points of emphasis of the last few years and to the implications of these for doctoral and M.A. programs. To be sure, each of these developments stems from earlier beginnings; in the last decade, however, a number of developments have directly influenced the English curriculum at all levels:

a. expansion of knowledge, especially in the area of conceptual and informational aspects of language structure.
b. development of programed instructional materials.
c. application of general concepts in curriculum construction to further refinement of teaching materials and methods in English.
d. search for identification of assumptions underlying both methods and materials used.
e. attempts to identify major concepts (or structures) to be taught.

We are told that our profession is in a state of ferment; all about us we see *ad hoc* committees, basic issues meetings, sample curricula developed by national groups, Project English curriculum development centers, research projects, state and national workshops devoted to problems of language and linguistics, revision of certification requirements, CEEB tri-component curricula, developments of multitrack programs, widespread use of paperbound books, summer institutes—even the development of an independent organization of college and university chairmen of departments of English.

All of this ferment, of course, is ultimately reflected in our teacher preparation programs and graduate programs. The kinds of programs which we devise must mirror this educational milieu—and realistically, the programs must reflect the kinds of positions our candidates in graduate programs will occupy. What kinds of positions seem to be genuinely within the purview of English education?

a. Teachers who return to the classroom to teach in more highly effective ways.
b. Supervisors or consultants at the state department of education level to lend leadership and guidance to statewide curriculum development.
c. Supervisors or consultants for large metropolitan centers to give leadership to citywide curriculum development, especially in rapidly changing urban environments.
d. Supervisors, master teachers, and departmental chairmen to staff departments in large city schools and laboratory schools to develop specific

experimental courses of study, initiate professional programs, and cooperate in or conduct research.

e. Professional educators—for a variety of tasks, but specifically to work in preprofessional and professional programs, with a strong background in literature and language, experience in teaching at the secondary level, and a special training in the disciplines of linguistics and psychology.

f. Professional educators, capable of directing research in English education, with a background enabling them to deal with both elementary and secondary curriculum problems, especially with emphasis on the teaching of reading and children's or adolescent literature (the latter two positions involving guidance and conduct of research).

g. Liaison personnel, to work at a variety of tasks, but mainly to implement the work of scholars and educators and to clarify the positions of each by active field work in the schools.

I have drawn this list, incomplete as it is, from the requests crossing my desk and from vacancies listed at the placement bureau of the University of Minnnesota.

I should like to add one other position not normally thought of as English education. This additional position is that of the director of freshman English in the college and university. In some institutions, he may perform the functions of several of the positions I have listed. Indeed, we are told, in the February, 1963, issue of *College English*, that: "In the colleges, the tower of strength is the director of freshmen English: he has a sound knowledge of what can be done in the high schools; he knows what young people will do; he is well trained in language and rhetoric." (p. 401). Certainly these are specifications for a person trained in English education.

### Effective Graduate Education

Why are these positions English education rather than English? I think the answer can be found, in part, at least, in the examination of graduate programs in English. I am not, I should like to make clear, suggesting that such programs are not valid for their purpose. I *am* suggesting that many such programs are invalid beyond their self-described end, which is scholarly research and college, preferably graduate, teaching. I remain to be convinced that an endless piling on of courses in English literature, often to the exclusion of courses in American literature, and not uncommonly to the exclusion of courses in the nature, history, and structure of the English language, is a satisfactory preparation for performing effectively in the kinds of positions I have outlined above.

On the other hand, I am equally convinced that English education must not be a mere piling on of courses in curriculum construction, tests and measurements, audiovisual methods, statistics, research design, personality analysis, educational history and philosophy, psychology of learning, group dynamics, and the like. The program in English education, it seems to me, must be a blend of English and of education in a specially designed program. The major department itself is of little consequence, so long as the other area is not excluded.

If the Allerton House conferees really believe in Resolution Number 4—concerning the status of professors of English education—I think the choice of major will be unimportant. Hopefully, the resolve will lead to the deed.

To fill each of the positions I have cited, the individual needs certain basic competencies in both English and education. That is, he must know the subject matter whereof he speaks, but he must be able also to deal with pedagogical problems in a highly practical way. He must not be so blinded by the idealism of scholarly research in literature that he cannot see the jungle of the adolescent society. He must be able to answer basic questions relevant to curricular change:

Whom are we teaching? For what purpose?
What curricular changes will effect improved learning processes?
What are the appropriate bases for curricular change?
What assumptions underlie the changes?
How does one evaluate changed programs?
What principles of teaching and learning are involved in these changes?

The individual capable of answering these questions (or at least knowing factors relevant to the questions) cannot be educated in the typical English graduate program. In many institutions at present the candidate is dissuaded from taking anything remotely related to education, and, in many cases, the candidate for a degree may not present a dissertation involving anything but "pure" English. I think specialists can be educated to deal with both the subject matter and problems cited above in graduate programs in English education.

I should like to make a series of special pleas for parts of the English education program which I feel may be lost sight of in the next decade. I should hope that the doctoral specialist in English education would have a rather intimate acquaintance with another language—if for no other purpose than to have, in the words of one of my colleagues, ". . . something up against which to rub his own. . . ." Quite obviously I am also suggesting that the specialist in English education know something of his own language—its nature, its history, its structure.

Further, I hope that the fields of English and education will be thought of in their broadest terms. The specialist in English education must be so educated that he can draw on information in the other disciplines relevant to English—the work, for example, of philosophers, psychologists working in the field of verbal behavior, rhetoricians, anthropologists, and sociologists. The English education specialist might well be as acquainted with Skinner as he is with Shelley, with Bloomfield as well as the Brontës. Within the foreseeable future, it may not be asking too much that the specialist in English education know something of Chomsky and Vygotsky, either in the original or in translation.

One last special plea—I should like the graduate specialist in English education to know something of the field of public address, together with its core, the analysis of argumentation and persuasion. Without this, he is limited in the perspective required of a professional who would educate others and who would develop sound programs for the secondary schools.

Is what I am proposing idealistic? I doubt it. Even if the present day

"market" did not demand these kinds of programs. And it does. Even if the future market did not demand them. And it will. I should still be persuaded, if only self-persuaded, that the effective English educationist, and I use that term in no pejorative sense, must be the well-rounded individual these programs would provide.

# FIFTH-YEAR PROGRAMS FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

**Richard A. Meade, University of Virginia**

My responsibility in this symposium is to report certain facts dealing with a new development in graduate programs in English education at the master's degree level: the so-called fifth-year program.

Graduate programs both in English and in education have for many years been designed for students who have completed undergraduate majors in English and certain education courses. More often than not the graduate student has already completely met both professional education and English requirements for a teaching certificate. Such a graduate program bearing the classification English education has probably had the student take about half his courses in English and about half in education with some degree of flexibility in this regard. For example, at my institution, the University of Virginia, we have had for about thirty years such a program leading to the Master of Arts degree. More recently we have had a similar program leading to the Master of Education degree.

Several years ago an innovation in master's work for teachers appeared in the form of a new degree, the Master of Arts in Teaching. This pattern, as is well known, is designed especially for graduates of liberal arts colleges who have not had education courses. Students in this program gain certification for teaching as well as further study in English while obtaining a graduate degree. In the last few years other programs similar to the Master of Arts in Teaching, but not attached to this particular degree, have appeared. Many are commonly referred to as "fifth-year" programs. A main characteristic of them is that the student is admitted without necessarily having completed any courses in his undergraduate days that were especially intended to prepare him for teaching. Another major distinction is that a "fifth-year" program of necessity includes classroom teaching practice, either in the form of traditional student teaching or the newer internship (although sometimes not for graduate course credit), unless this requirement is waived because of teaching experience in states that allow a person to teach without professional certification.

Last fall the Executive Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English decided to prepare a bulletin setting forth descriptions of both "fifth-year" and "five-year" programs of teacher preparation. The "five-year" program differs from the "fifth-year" program in that a prospective teacher enters it as early as the first college year, and usually no later than the third college year, with his work both in English and in education designed for teacher education. On the other hand, in the "fifth-year" program the student does not begin teacher preparation until his fifth college year, which comes as an appendix to regular baccalaureate work although the student on his own may indeed have elected certain courses to prepare him for teaching.

The National Council has asked me to prepare the bulletin just mentioned, and I have received information from many of you and others through ques-



46

tionnaires distributed last November. It is my purpose now to summarize some of this information about "fifth-year" programs, many of which result in the awarding of a degree although others are designed solely to provide certification for teaching. The facts presented here are about degree-awarding programs and come from reports on thirty-one programs in twenty-nine institutions (two schools having two such degree programs each). Although other programs were described in returned questionnaires, these thirty-one have been selected because (1) they do not require any work in education for admission and (2) they do not take appreciably longer than an academic year and a summer to complete. The term "fifth-year" program as used here refers to an initial teacher education program, and the lack of prior training in education attests to this fact, it is assumed.

### Summary of Requirements

As to other admissions policies, 25 of the 31 programs require a major in English. In general, other programs ask the candidate to have the usual number of prerequisite credits for entrance to graduate English courses in the institution concerned. As to degrees awarded, 8 programs of the 31 give the Master of Education; 11, the Master of Arts; 4, the Master of Science; 6, the Master of Arts in Teaching; and 2, either the Master of Science or the Master of Arts.

In addition, 13 institutions specify a certain average grade as necessary for admission as follows: a B average, 5; a high C-plus average, 2; a C-plus average, 5; and a C average, 1. There are also certain more general requirements in many schools.

Of the 31 programs, 8 can be completed in one academic year; 18, in one academic year and one summer; 4, in an academic year and two summers; and 1, in three trimesters. Two programs that take two or more years are not included in this account because the questionnaire mentioned the equivalent of a single year as a minimum time limit.

The semester-hour requirement for the greatest number of programs, 12, is 30. One program requires only 26. Four require 32 semester-hours; 3 require 33; 4 require 36; 4 require 40; one, 46; and one, 46 and two-thirds. One respondent indicated a total of 87 hours including undergraduate requirements in both English and education.

All programs, of course, divide the required hours between English and education. Twenty-three programs designate a minimum number of semester-hours in English, which ranges from 3 to 24 with an average stated minimum of 12.4 semester-hours. Eighteen programs state a maximum number of required hours in English with a range of from 12 to 28 with an average maximum requirement of 17 semester-hours.

As to requirements in education, 27 programs state a minimum, with a range of from 3 to 40 semester-hours, and an average requirement of 16.9 semester-hours. Twenty-four state a maximum, with a range of from 4 to 40, and an average requirement of 18.9 semester-hours.

About two-thirds of the programs mention no specific courses in English as required. Only four specify more than one course. Eight programs mention a

course in language; two cite advanced composition. Three mention courses that were usually classified as education by the persons filling in these questionnaires; that is, the Teaching of English and the Improvement of the Teaching of Reading in the Secondary School. It is clear that most of the programs determine the English courses by the individual student's background and interests with the intent of correcting whatever deficiencies, if any, may have existed in his undergraduate program for a prospective teacher of English.

On the other hand, all the programs except two specify required courses in education. The obvious reason for naming courses in education and not in English is that the student usually comes to the program with a major in English, but he generally comes without any credit in education. The titles mentioned most often are educational psychology, 16 times; philosophy of education, 13 times; the teaching of English, 12 times with 3 programs requiring a second course in addition to this subject; and principles of teaching (principles of learning, general methods), 9 times.

These figures may point to one distinct lack in some of these new programs in English education. Among the 29 institutions, only 12 require a course in the teaching of English. Nine more do require a course in general methods, or principles of teaching or learning, but it is difficult to think that this kind of course can really substitute for one in the teaching of English, although I should consider it appropriate in its own right—a course that might well precede or accompany one in the teaching of the subject. Ten institutions appear not to require either general or special methods. Can it be that the 17 institutions not requiring a course in English education do not offer one? I have long known that certain undergraduate programs do not include an English education course, but it seems that an institution sufficiently involved in teacher education to offer work at the graduate level certainly should provide this kind of study.

### Status of Student Teaching

Twenty-three institutions give credit in semester-hours for student or intern teaching, the amount ranging from four to ten semester-hours, with six being the predominant figure. Programs with no semester-hours of credit for student or intern teaching usually require that the student have this kind of experience without attaching credit hours to it. Virtually all student teaching in fifth-year degree programs is the full-day type of experience ranging from six weeks in length to an entire year.

Fifteen institutions are willing to waive this practice requirement if one, two, or three years of regular teaching have been successfully completed. The carefully supervised internship in which the cadet teacher receives a regular salary, or some part of one, is apparently accepted today as satisfactory practice. One may wonder, however, whether regular teaching experience without any guarantee of real supervision accompanying it should be accepted in lieu of supervised student teaching or a supervised internship.

As a part of the fifth-year training program only three institutions require a thesis. Fourteen will allow a thesis to replace some other aspect of the program, usually six semester-hours of course work. Another question may be

raised at this point: Is a thesis a desirable part of a teacher training program that occupies only an academic year plus a summer?

Here we have a picture of 31 fifth-year programs that provide the prospective teacher with the opportunity (1) to become certified even if he has previously taken no courses for that purpose, and (2) to achieve a graduate degree at the same time. Also, 26 programs were reported that claim the purpose of providing certification through a fifth-year of work that is not planned to lead to a degree, but I shall not review facts about these. Fifth-year programs for teacher education, as well as five-year programs, indicate some movement in the direction of providing a longer time than the usual four-year undergraduate pattern for the preservice education of teachers.

The fifth-year program raises the question of whether the student will ever do real graduate work in the education component of his training. Although the courses in education in the fifth year may be labeled graduate, the fact remains that they are *first* courses. Graduate work, it seems to me, is nearly always a *second* look and a more *mature* look. When will the teacher take this kind of look at the content dealt with in educational psychology or in English education? It is too early in this fifth-year movement to see the answer to this question, but it seems to me pertinent to raise it.

Teacher education in a fifth college year constitutes one current type of graduate program in English education. It is in this context that I have offered these facts and observations today.

# THE 1962 CEEB SUMMER INSTITUTES: THEIR ACHIEVEMENT AND PROMISE*

John C. Gerber, University of Iowa

Of the many enterprises undertaken during the last few years to upgrade the teaching of English, the 1962 Summer Institute Program sponsored by the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board has been the most dramatic and, in many ways, the most promising. Already it is clear that the effects of this program are being felt in many high school classes, and that the formula devised by the Commission on English is being copied widely and successfully. The potential usefulness of such Institutes for the advanced training of high school English teachers, therefore, has already been demonstrated. What makes the CEEB Institutes of especial significance to MLA members, however, is that the program required twenty of the most influential departments of English in the country to involve themselves *directly* in this advanced training of high school teachers. These were not institutes conducted by professors of education with the casual blessing of Departments of English; these were institutes administered and largely taught by professors of English. The difference is a very great one indeed. Whether we like it or not, the CEEB Institutes have, in effect, forced those of us in Departments of English to acknowledge a substantial responsibility for improving the quality of English teaching in the high schools. Because of them—and of such subsequent activities as the Allerton Conference and the Curriculum Centers—a new appraisal of our proper professional functions has been quietly taking place on one campus after another. Even now it is no exaggeration to say, I believe, that a Department of English may no longer claim to be of the top rank unless it includes among its programs one or more designed to aid the high school English teacher, both the tenderfoot and the old-timer.

The purpose of this paper, however, is not to explore the implications of these reappraisals that are taking place, but to examine the CEEB Institutes that were so influential in initiating them. What were they? How good were they? What should be done to make future institutes better? These are some of the questions to which this report will address itself.

Since I had nothing to do with the organization or operation of the Institutes, I should probably explain at the outset why I have been asked to write this paper. Just before the CEEB Institutes opened in the summer of 1962, eleven of us were commissioned by the Office of Education to make an independent evaluation of them.[1] What the Office of Education wanted to know was

* Professor Gerber's report to the conference is subsumed in an article published in *PMLA*, September 1963. This paper is an abridgement of the *PMLA* article.

[1] The eleven Evaluators included William P. Albrecht (University of Kansas), Dwight L. Burton (Florida State University), Leon T. Dickinson (Missouri University), Frederick L. Gwynn (Trinity College), Sumner Ives (Syracuse University), John E. Jordan (University of California, Berkeley), John C. McGalliard (University of Iowa), Lorietta Scheerer (Redondo Beach High School, Redondo Beach, Calif.), Eugene E. Slaughter (Southeastern State College, Durant, Okla.), Donald R. Tuttle (Office of Education), Rosemary Wilson (School District of Philadelphia), and John C. Gerber (University of Iowa), Chairman.

whether these Institutes were activities worth the investment of federal funds. In addition, the Office hoped to be able to publish a report that would be useful for those sponsoring future institutes, whether they were federally supported or not. As a result, the eleven of us, traveling singly, visited all but one of the twenty Institutes at least twice, the normal visit being for the full school week of five days.

Since the Institute staffs had not been fully informed of the fact that we would be descending upon them in this way, it would be stretching the truth a bit to say that they were enchanted when the first visitor arrived. But they bore up bravely and almost did us in with their hospitality. They gave us complete freedom to attend their classes, interview their participants, and talk with their colleagues and administrators. Later, principally in January and February of 1963, we visited the classrooms of 64 of the 868 Institute participants, the 64 being selected to represent Institutes; geographical sections; large and small, urban and rural, and public and parochial high schools. In evaluating the Institutes and their immediate impact upon the teaching of the participants, we have employed over 200 criteria grouped under such headings as aims, staff, participants, curriculum, tests, schedules, and physical arrangements. The complete and final report of our study will shortly be made to the Office of Education and presumably will then be made public by that agency in the form of a monograph. What follows, after a brief description of the Institutes, is a condensed version of our evaluation of their curriculum.

### Facts About the Institutes

The prime desire of the CEEB Commission on English was to upgrade the teaching of English in the nation's secondary schools, especially the teaching of English to college-bound students. More specifically, it hoped (1) to improve the academic preparation of 900 carefully selected teachers of English, (2) to amass samples of excellent teaching materials appropriate for college preparatory classes in grades 9 through 12, (3) to engage university faculties more actively and more realistically in teacher training, and (4) to prove the feasibility of similar institutes, supported by grants from foundations or from the federal government, beginning in 1963.

Since the Commission hoped to reinvigorate the teaching of English on a national scale, it invited departments of English in 20 universities from coast to coast to act as hosts for the Institutes. The first 20 to be invited accepted: Cornell, Duke, Harvard, Indiana, Michigan, Nevada, NYU, Ohio State, Penn State, Pittsburgh, Rutgers, St. Louis, Southern Illinois, Stanford, State University of New York at Albany, Texas, Tulane, UCLA, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Normally, Institute classes met every school day for either six or eight weeks, depending upon the length of the university's summer session. At most Institutes a workshop was scheduled for two or three afternoons a week, though at Harvard the whole sixth week was set aside for it. At Michigan an optional workshop was offered during the last two weeks. The host university awarded graduate credit varying from five to twelve hours, depending upon local decisions and practices.

To be of continuing service to the participants and to evaluate the immediate impact of its Institute, each host university released one staff member half-time during the fall term, 1962-63, to visit the high school classes of every participant. In his visits this instructor tried particularly to see what use was made of the ideas and practices learned in the Institute, how useful the workshop materials were proving to be, and to what extent the participant was sharing with his colleagues the concepts and materials he had gained in the Institute. To evaluate its program, the Commission on English will use the reports of these follow-up visits, reports from the Directors of the Institutes, the results of diagnostic and final tests, and whatever other data it can assemble. The Commission promises that its final report will appear early in 1964.

### Curriculum

The curriculum of the Institutes consisted of three courses—Literature, Language, Composition—and a workshop. It was a format that won an overwhelming endorsement from both the staffs of the Institutes and the participants. And well it should have. It included graduate training in the three disciplines in which an English teacher must develop sophistication, and it provided an opportunity for the participants to translate this graduate training into the practical work of the high school classroom. While there is a place for the more specialized institute—one, for instance, in linguistics alone—it is hard to see how the CEEB format can be improved upon if one is attempting to provide a rounded training within a single summer session. Our Evaluators were unanimous and enthusiastic in approving the design of the curriculum. Whatever reservations they had with respect to the curriculum were concerned with the operation of the several parts. The discussion that follows, therefore, will be of the three courses and the workshop considered separately.

*The Literature Course.* The aim of the Literature course was "to increase the teacher's knowledge of what is involved in the close reading of a literary work." To this aim the instructors closely adhered. Although extrinsic considerations occasionally entered informally into the class discussions, there was little or no formal attempt to include them. The classes in all Institutes followed the syllabus closely; they began with an examination of poetry and then moved to fiction and drama. Matters of primary interest were genre, point of view, structure, meaning, and mode. Subsidiary elements that received especial stress were imagery, figures, symbols, irony, paradox, diction, and syntax. There was much fruitful discussion in all twenty classes about what will "open up" a text for the reader so that he can read with greater pleasure and understanding.

The participants gave their overwhelming endorsement to this course. Of the 809 who responded to a poll taken toward the end of the session, 78 percent found the emphasis on close analysis "fully acceptable" or "acceptable"; 82 percent rated the organization and scope "excellent" or "good"; 81 percent thought the level of difficulty "about right"; 77 percent thought the course "extremely valuable" or "valuable" for their own education; and 58 percent rated its practical value for their own teaching either "extremely helpful" or "helpful." The 64 participants interviewed by our Evaluators in January

and February 1963 were still enthusiastic about the course though only 45 percent said that it had actually been "extremely helpful" or "helpful" to them in their teaching of literature during the first semester of the school year.

There are many signs that the impact of the course was being felt in the classes taught by these participants, but possibly not so many signs as the Commission might have hoped for. Close to 60 percent reported that they had made no change in the organization of their work as a result of the course, though several in this group said that their courses were already organized for work in close analysis and a few others said that they planned to recommend changes when next their curriculum was up for study. Many pointed out that the effects of the course could best be seen not in any reorganization of their courses but in their stronger insistence upon careful reading. Yet here and there, organizational changes had already taken place. In order of frequency, the most important of these were a dropping or modifying of a strictly chronological organization in favor of the generic, more integration of the work in literature and composition, more use of contemporary literature, and a greater emphasis upon poetry. One participant said he was organizing the junior year around tragedy, and another mentioned that he was developing a seminar for ten gifted students.

About half of the 64 participants interviewed said that in classroom procedures they were spending more time having students analyze literary works in class, they were trying to ask more probing questions, they were giving more attention to the author's "voice" and to imagery, they were requiring more writing in class, and they were making greater use of panel discussions and oral reports. Many participants felt that the intellectual tone of their class work in literature had greatly improved.

*The Language Course.* The stated purposes of the Language course were (1) to make the teacher more aware of language as a field of study, (2) to show him the basic assumptions and methods of linguistics, and (3) to encourage him to undertake further study of linguistics and offer guidelines for that study. In order to accomplish these aims the linguistics instructors agreed upon a syllabus that identified five areas of study: the nature of language and how it can be studied, phonology, grammar, varieties of language and usage, and historical changes in usage. To the extent that these five areas were touched upon in all 20 Language courses, it can be said that the instructors followed the syllabus. But that is about all that can be said. The instructors gave their own emphases to the course, often had quite different things to say about the new grammars, and employed their own teaching techniques, some of which were strikingly ingenious.

When polled toward the end of the Institute sessions, 64 percent of over 800 participants found the objectives of the course "fully acceptable" or "acceptable"; 65 percent thought the organization of the course "excellent" or "good"; 68 percent thought the level of difficulty "about right"; and 63 percent thought the course "extremely valuable" or "valuable" for their own education. But only 35 percent thought it "extremely helpful" or "helpful" to them as teachers. Roughly two-thirds of the participants, therefore, approved

of the course in most respects; the other third varied from those who were mildly displeased to those who actively resented it.

When our Evaluators interviewed 64 of these participants in January and February of 1963, well over two-thirds had kind things to say about the course. There was still a minority which complained that the course went so fast they could learn nothing well. Some felt that too much time had been spent on phonetics, that the course was disorganized, and that the instructor was too evangelical. Some were still downright resentful that the instructor had been so patronizing toward them because of their predilections for traditional grammar. But the great majority felt they had been given a broader and more accurate concept of what language really is. Those who previously had had some experience with structural or tranformational grammer claimed that the course accelerated what one liked to call his "liberal tendencies." Many mentioned their gratitude for a sharper terminology, for excellent bibliographies, and for a stronger linguistic background. Most of those who still professed to be traditionalists were apologetic, maintaining that they were clinging to the old concepts only until they learned more about the new. A majority of the 64 interviewed said they planned to study more in the field, either by taking graduate courses or by reading on their own. One said the course so excited him that he might well specialize in linguistics. In short, these participants seemed to give the course a heart-warming endorsement.

When asked whether they had reorganized their courses in any respect as a result of attending the Institute classes, about 60 percent said that they had. They indicated such innovations as units on the history of the language, the levels of usage, etymology, dictionary study, and local dialects. Several said they were introducing elements of structural grammar into their courses; two, for example, said they were placing the stress on sentences instead of parts of speech. One was using phonemes in teaching spelling, another in teaching punctuation. One had developed a unit on the language structure of a poem; another had a series of lessons on the morphology in *1984*. Several were reorganizing their courses to accommodate them to Roberts' *Patterns of English*. And one somewhat dazed gentleman said that he had elimmated all the units in his course involving a study of traditional grammar, but he wasn't quite sure what he had put in their places. Most of these course changes were slight, but it was probably too much to expect general reorganizations the first year after the Institutes.

*The Composition Course.* The principal aim of the Composition course was to help the participant become a better writer himself and a better critic of others' writing. It attempted "to give a new experience and awareness that will increase the teacher's power to evoke good writing from his students, both by better directed assignments and by more accurate judgments of their writing." Since the composition experts attending the 1961 planning session could not agree on a single syllabus, they created two. The first was essentially subjective and experiential, stressing the role of the writer; the second was basically diagnostic, stressing the art of writing. The first syllabus was employed at Cornell, Harvard, Indiana, NYU, Penn State, Pittsburgh, Rutgers, Stanford,

Tulane, and UCLA; the second at Albany, Duke, Michigan, Nevada, Ohio State, St. Louis, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. Southern Illinois developed a synthesis of the two syllabi. It would be difficult to prove that one Composition course was more effective than the other. Our Evaluators found the first more interesting because the material was fresher and, possibly, more substantial. Furthermore, the instructors clearly had a more messianic fervor; their voices were pitched a bit higher; their gestures were more abandoned; and their assignments were more ingenious. But there was no evidence that they urged their students to a higher pitch of creative activity or that the students were more grateful. Indeed, the participants from the other course seemed later to find that its approach and materials were more helpful in teaching composition in high school.

During the 64 follow-up visits, slightly over 60 percent from the course emphasizing the role of the writer and 48 percent from the course emphasizing the artistic product said they had reorganized their work, at least in part, since returning from the Institutes. Participants from both groups testified that they were placing more stress on expository and less on imaginative writing, that they were trying harder to integrate the work in composition and literature, and that they were giving more emphasis to composition generally. In addition, participants from the first group mentioned reorganization in order to give more weight to such matters as the speaker's relation to his audience, "voice," tone, style and definition; those from the second group emphasized changes to give greater stress to such matters as purpose, introductions, paragraph organization, transitions, and deadwood.

Of the participants from the course emphasizing the writer, 60 percent said they had made changes in classroom procedures; from the course emphasizing the written product, almost 70 percent said the same. Participants from both groups said they were making more use of mimeographed materials in class and hoped to be able to use an opaque projector. Both groups mentioned that they were having more class discussion and more close analysis in this discussion. Participants from the first course particularly mentioned experimentation with the Socratic method, with the integration in class of work in composition and literature, and with classroom conference. Students from the second course mentioned experimentation with class analysis of themes, with class themes written under pressure of time, and with the grading of themes in class and by the class.

Two-thirds of the participants from the course emphasizing the role of the author maintained that they were changing their assignments; almost 80 percent from the course emphasizing the artistic product said the same. The changes attributed to the Institute courses by the two groups were almost precisely the same: they were assigning shorter and more frequent papers than before; they were placing greater emphasis upon expository writing; they were trying to focus their assignments more sharply and to make the statements of assignments more specific; they were attempting to vary their assignments more; having experienced the agony of having their own papers red-penciled, they were reading their students' papers with more discernment and compassion; they were reading more for the overall effectiveness and less for mechanical

lapses; and they were placing more emphasis upon marginal comments and less upon letter or numerical grades. One participant surely must have had his gears in reverse when he said that since the Institute—and presumably because of it—the English department of which he is head has drafted a list of penalties to assess in each grade level for theme errors.

As good as they were, though, the Composition courses could have been better. There seemed to be no compelling reason for two courses. Whatever the issues that split the group in the 1961 planning session, there seemed to be none during the time of the Institutes that was irresolvable. To the extent that the courses differed, they were simply complementary. Each would have been enriched by material from the other. A good course in composition, it would seem, should deal both with the producer and the product, as the synthesis achieved in the Southern Illinois Institute demonstrated.

The standards in the Composition course must be a matter of constant concern. The moment an instructor nodded, the course slipped down to the level of freshman English—or below. To deserve graduate credit, this must be an *advanced* course in writing. No textbook commonly employed in freshman English courses should be used. Nor should assignments commonly imposed on freshmen be made. The readings should be the finest in the fields of rhetoric and stylistics. The field of aesthetics could contribute much, and so might genetic criticism, such as that in *The Road to Xanadu*. The use of the *Phaedrus* proved that powerful rhetorical demonstrations, when not made an end in themselves, can be useful in a composition class. It hardly need be added that assignments should be ones that require the highest level of sensitivity and reflection of which the participants are capable. These are obvious generalizations, but they need to be stated. There was a serious question in the minds of our Evaluators as to whether some of the CEEB Composition courses merited graduate credit. Even the participants sometimes complained that they were not being pushed hard enough.

Class meetings should be reduced sufficiently to make individual conferences possible. Many of the composition instructors divided their class of 45 into two sections and met them separately. Their argument was that they could not handle a subject so intimate and detailed as composition in large sections.

*The Workshop.* The workshop seemed to be a nightmare for the staffs of most of the Institutes. This was the one aspect of the Institutes that seemed not to have been worked out with care. Franker than some of the others, one Director said he just wished the workshop would go away.

In theory the workshop was to be the capstone of the Institute. It was in the workshop that the participants were to bring together the material from the three courses, integrate it, and apply it in working out lessons that they would then test in their own classes during the following school year. These laudable aims were achieved in substantial measure by a fair number of participants. But they were not achieved generally enough for it to be said that the workshop program as a whole was an outstanding success.

It is difficult and probably not necessary to describe the operation of the workshops in detail. There were 13 different workshop schedules in the 20 Institutes, varying from one that required only two rather short afternoon

meetings a week to one that set aside two whole weeks for workshop activities. In addition, there were at least 14 ways of organizing the workshops: everything from putting each participant on his own to dividing the participants into three large groups, one for each of the three disciplines. Such diversity, to be sure, does not necessarily indicate weakness, but in this instance our Evaluators came to feel that it did. The lack of uniformity in schedules and organization seemed to reflect a general uncertainty about the nature and function of the workshop program.

Nevertheless the workshops succeeded in bringing the participants together in relatively informal groups where they could share experiences and discuss their common professional problems. In the opinion of many participants, this was their most useful function. In addition, of course, the workshops resulted in the production of scores of projects and lesson plans worked out by the participants individually or in groups. Many of the simpler ones had already been tried out in high school classes before our Evaluators visited the schools in January and February. Among the more ambitious and yet untried were a project in composition involving a ten-unit course curriculum and one in language calling for a sequential program in high school linguistics. Undoubtedly, the most ambitious, however, was the 200-page St. Louis "syllabus," a work which covered all three disciplines and attempted to outline a four-year sequence of studies designed to emphasize academic interests—both literary and scientific—and prepare the student for college work. For each grade the syllabus stated aims, provided a course of study, listed typical works to be assigned, and included a few detailed plans with suggestions for applying the studies of literature, composition, and linguistics in a specific context. As the Commission on English had hoped, many of the workshop projects, like the St. Louis syllabus, managed to combine work in two and sometimes three disciplines; that is, a project in the study of, say, Crane's "Open Boat" might include provisions for making a lexical gloss and for writing a critical essay.

Despite their evident accomplishments, the bulk of the evidence indicates that the workshops fell far short of the hopes that the Commission had for them. The points of weakness were not hard to find; indeed, most of them were singled out for our Evaluators by the participants and by staff members as well. It should not be inferred from the following list of particulars that all of the CEEB workshops were weak at all of these points. Far from it. These were points of weakness, however, found commonly enough to bear mention. They should serve as warnings to supervisors of future workshops.

1. OBJECTIVES. The results of the attempt by the Commission on English to use the workshops primarily for the amassing of teaching materials were not altogether fortunate. The objectives of a workshop should be less concerned with production and quantity, more concerned with the critical examination of concepts and procedures.
2. LEADERSHIP. Much too often the CEEB supervisor was grossly unsophisticated about high school English. His sentiments were sound, but his advice was impractical. Patently, the supervisor of the workshop should be someone who is at once sympathetic with the philosophy and

objectives of the Institute and yet knows high school teaching, the problems of curriculum making, and the techniques of dealing with high school administrators.

3. SCHEDULE. Many participants complained—and our Evaluators agreed—that when the courses and workshop operated concurrently, the schedule became much too heavy, even for the best students. Furthermore, the courses had far too little impact upon workshop projects when these projects had to be selected and organized while the courses were just getting under way. The workshop should follow the courses, not operate concurrently with them.

4. ORGANIZATION. What the CEEB participants complained about most bitterly was the lack of organization in the workshops. Much too often, they did not clearly know where the workshop was heading or what their particular obligations were. The result was that individually or in groups they themselves too often had to try to make sense out of what one participant called "chaos."

But the last word should be a tribute to the vision and wisdom of the members of the CEEB Commission on English who planned these Institutes, financed them, and saw them through to completion. Their format was sound in principle; their staffs were dedicated and hard-working; and their participants, whatever the weaknesses of particular Institutes, were immensely benefited. What is possibly most impressive is the continuing influence of the Institutes, not only in the classrooms and school systems of the 1962 participants, but also in the universities that have imitated the CEEB program in 1963—and doubtless now in the classroom of *their* participants. Such influence deserves to spread. For while our evaluation has stressed—possibly overstressed—certain of the operational weaknesses of the CEEB Institutes, it has not criticized their basic principles or the overall organization. Taken as a whole, the program is both comprehensive and intellectually respectable. If the general competence of high school teachers *can* be substantially improved within a summer session, institutes modelled on the CEEB plan seem to be the most promising means for doing it.

# THE CASE FOR AND AGAINST THE THREE-COMPONENT CURRICULUM IN ENGLISH

**Lennox Grey, Teachers College, Columbia University**

One of the most important services to teachers of English in our time has unquestionably been that of the recently retired executive secretary of the MLA, George Winchester Stone, in initiating, securing Ford Foundation support for, and conducting the Basic Issues Conferences of 1958 (which brought together some twenty-eight representatives of the American Studies Association, the College English Association, the Modern Language Association, and the National Council of Teachers of English) and arranging for the publication of *The Basic Issues* in bulletin form in 1959 [1] and in paperback book in 1961.[2]

From those conferences have come stimulating and challenging developments. Among the most challenging is Professor Stone's "An Articulated English Program: A Hypothesis to Test," urging radical concentration on a writing component, a literature component, and teacher training elements focused on these two components.[3] Few college teachers have taken such pains to think through the cumulative development of these components from the elementary to the graduate school. This thinking-through has been followed by the challenging sponsorship of the proposal by the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board in a series of summer workshops for teachers which have not only stressed the literature and composition components but appear to have lifted linguistics from the status of a subcomponent to that of a main component, and literary criticism to the status of a fourth component. Simultaneously, on a still wider front ranging from the development of local programs to the national Project English, one can see responses to both the Basic Issues Report and the Articulated English Program. On the whole, there has probably been a more clearly identifiable response to the Articulated English Program than to the 35 tough basic issues. It is immediately reassuring or comforting to turn to the neat comparative simplicity of a two- or three-component curriculum.

The case is strong and cogent, particularly as a matter of educational statesmanship, for a concentration on needs in literature and writing at this time, and even more for an improved program for preparing teachers, enlisting the fullest possible range of academic and professional resources for the task. Literature and writing are components which members of the several associations have in common and can come together on. They are fields in need of attention and ready for development on several counts. Literary and linguistic scholars are developing exciting new knowledge and methods in literary criticism and the study of language that promise much for teachers too heavily loaded to keep abreast of the growth of literature itself. Some of these develop-

[1] *The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English*, supplement to the *English Journal*, September 1959.

[2] George W. Stone, Jr., (ed.), *Issues, Problems, and Approaches in the Teaching of English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961).

[3] George W. Stone, Jr., Supplement to *PMLA*, September 1959.

ments promise much for teachers who lack hours enough in the day and night to read and correct as many students' writings as seem desirable according to the older handbook grammar and usage practices. Other important matters have been getting a larger share of attention—particularly the context of the student's experience, the context of liberal or general education, of which English is a part, and the context of modern communication that is affecting our work in many ways. It is high time, then, that there be some concerted fresh work on these two components with which English began as a school and college subject just about a century ago.

### Omissions in the Three-Component Program

Any potential case against the two- or three-component curriculum is not so likely to be against what is included as it is likely to point at what may be ignored or seemingly rejected. American and British literature, the Bible, classic and Nordic myth, and writing are all good. I, for one, have devoted most of my life to them and do not propose to "make a case" against them. But any responsible designer of graduate programs to prepare English teachers must consider actual and potential cases for and against any proposal as he has had to consider them for other proposals of the past thirty years aimed at unifying and focusing the English program—such as the unifying concepts of the comprehensive humanities programs, or experience curricula, or correlated curricula, or communication-communication arts components, or American studies as American humanities, or English language arts in a "human-growth-and-development" and "areas of living" context. In my opinion these have not been "driftings" but alternatives and possibilities in the dialectic essential to any professional field.

How well, we must ask ourselves, does the newest two- or three-component program answer the well-stated question in Basic Issue 20—

> Can the English profession define its function narrowly enough to promise a really good job of what it tries to do, yet broadly enough to encourage the most fruitful cooperation with other studies and with the whole educational enterprise?

Hasn't the emphasis in "An Articulated English Program" fallen too much on the "narrowly" and not enough on the "broadly"? What of the humanities, to take the most conspicuous example of a broader context, the hard-won unifying context for English which has been provided over the past thirty years by humanities programs at Columbia, Chicago, Harvard, Stanford, Florida, to name only a few, and their extensions to high schools through the John Hay Whitney programs and the new Encyclopaedia Britannica Humanities films? In "An Articulated English Program" I find reference to "humanistic values" but only a little of humanities breadth. Is "An Articulated English Program," with its emphasis so far on American and British literature, open then to the charge of being an isolationist program? We all know, of course, that skillful teaching *can* reach out to the whole world from American and British literature. But *will* we, and will other teachers, if we do not make that possibility more explicit than I have heard it made so far? And finally, won't a good many of us be troubled, in time, by what may be

considered also an isolationist *non sequitur* between the Basic Issues and the three-component curriculum—with the latter appearing to answer by edict rather than by inquiry or actual testing of the "hypothesis" the many unresolved points in the Basic Issues? Consider this one, concerned with the broader study of the humanities, Basic Issue No. 25: "Ideally, how much college study of language and literature is desirable for the secondary school teacher?"—which reads as follows:

> English teachers should know their English. But their teaching of English is likely to be sounder if they also know at least one foreign language, other humanities, something of the social sciences and natural sciences.

Actually, I have not been fearful that English would become generally isolationist as a result of the two- or three-component proposals, whatever the narrowness of the starting point. I have been confident that English teachers coming together in summer workshops and other conferences would sooner or later reach out to the larger questions of context, reintroducing the larger considerations of the humanities, of which American and British literature are important parts. But there is a question of sooner rather than later, and a danger of misleading our colleagues in other fields and the public as well as teachers who have had narrow training and will here feel they have justification.

### Effect on Graduate Education

The effect of "An Articulated Program" upon the graduate department of which I am a part (which I like to think of as offering one of those "well-established fifth-year programs . . . found in some states where a master's degree or equivalent is required of secondary teachers" mentioned in Basic Issue 27) will probably be to increase our emphasis upon the humanities while we also continue to emphasize the three components which we have concentrated upon since the 1940's in three basic courses: (1) The Reading and Criticism of Literature (recently expanded a little under the title "Literature and the Literary Audience" in order to help English teachers gauge and cope with our Dwight McDonalds who are beating up or whipping up an unhealthy elite-mass issue); (2) The Study of Language; and (3) Communication and the Communication Arts in the Modern Community, in which teachers get insight into the problems of communication context they face and the resources they may use from cultural anthropologists, from philosophers concerned with communications, from artists in various fields concerned with their communication role, and others. These are followed, of course, by more advanced studies in American literature, British literature, and world literature, by studies in classical influences on literature, by more advanced studies in literary criticism and linguistics, and by other relevant courses in other graduate faculties of the university. Our own courses in American, British, and world literature and in linguistics, and our seminars, are largely concerned with the scholarly substance and method of these fields as they can be drawn on for teaching. In student teaching and internships we seek to make the applications, with attention to the varying contexts in which English teachers teach.

A word or two should be said about "communication" in relation to

English and the humanities. Let me say in all friendliness and frankness that I do not think an "Articulated English Program" or a three-component literature-writing-linguistics curriculum will accomplish by such casual reading what is suggested about the modern communication context in the opening paragraph on writing in "An Articulated English Program":

> The *writing-component* of "English" is equally sequential and incremental and exciting, involved as it is with the development of a critical sense and organizing ability. One function of good reading is to provide a context for relating and putting into perspective the many things that bombard the mind of the student daily in the press, motion pictures, television, and radio (including the mixture of fact, propaganda, advertising, and disjointed communication).

If teachers are to cope with the contemporary communication context, they must give concentrated attention to it somewhere: to the very considerable and respectable scholarship that has been developed in it in the past thirty years and to its application in the context of English teaching. In our program we learned this the hard way, and yet in a very rewarding way. Between 1938 and 1941, members of the Barnard College, Columbia College, and Teachers College English and foreign language faculties carried on a seminar for liberal arts college graduates in language arts and humanities. The 15 to 17 student members each year were teaching while they were studying, in ways anticipating the Master of Arts in Teaching. They studied the new linguistics, the literature of America and the British Isles, and literature included in the new humanities programs. In the first year we offered a literature component of the Great Books type, with great pleasure but with very little apparent transfer from the seminar to the high school classroom. In the second year, in those days of the first "good neighbor" policy with Latin America, we made comparative studies of the literature read in North America and that read in Latin America. There was more transfer but not enough. That was before the days of the Puerto Rican migration. In the third year we concentrated on the literary humanities with excursions into the other arts, currently evident in New York City as a cultural capital. We included film and radio programs. Immediately there was effective transfer, starting with the familiar film and radio experiences and continuing naturally as we moved to literature and the other arts, old and new.[4] We did not publicize our findings. We hoped to carry on another three-year trial and demonstration. But the war blocked both publication and further research at that time. At times it threatened to blot out the humanities, English, and much besides that we value in liberal and professional education. But in the name of communication and the communication arts we were able to serve both an acute wartime need and the interests of English and the humanities through these communication arts as a kind of contemporary applied humanities, put to test on a national and even international scale. And from what we saw tested and were sure of we

[4] *Columbia University Cooperative Program for the Pre-Service Education of Teachers: A Staff Report of a Three-Year Demonstration Conducted by Barnard College, Columbia College, and Teachers College in Cooperation with the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education*, E. S. Evenden and R. Freeman Butts, editors (New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1942), pp. 63–65.

developed our three components of literature, linguistics, and communication arts. Of course, we were accused of going overboard on "communication," when actually our single graduate communication course was only one of three basic components, and not more than a tenth ordinarily in an 18- to 24-semester-hour English component in our master's program.

In the 12 or 14 or 16 or 19 years at our disposal for the teaching of English, is it "fragmenting," "drifting," or "crowding" to make a place for the comprehensive humanities, and for some other reinforcing components besides?

## COMMENTS AND REACTIONS

**Dora V. Smith, Professor Emeritus, University of Minnesota**

We have enjoyed a stimulating and profitable conference, considering together the problems of English education. I know you wish me to express our thanks once more to those who have worked with vigor and with foresight to make our gathering here a memorable one.

We have agreed unanimously on the importance of an adequate background in academic subject matter for those who are to teach English in the junior and senior high schools of this country. Such a program, we believe, should include (1) knowledge of English, American, and world literature; (2) an introduction to the historical development of the English language and understanding of the present status of structural linguistics; and (3) at least one course in composition beyond freshman English, which should help prospective teachers to understand and to practice the principles of expository and personal writing which they will teach to high school pupils.[1]

Dr. Robert Pooley has revealed to us a dearth of research which should undergird our program of teacher preparation in English. He has also pointed out too general inadequacy among us in understanding the techniques of research necessary to intelligent reading of studies by others and to effective designing of our own. We who teach English have seldom enjoyed an innate capacity for mathematics. Fortunately, we have men and women on our staffs in education and in mathematics who can help us. Would it not be profitable for us to set up seminars for ourselves to which we might invite our colleagues who are proficient in research to explain to us the terms necessary for efficient reading of significant studies? Then out of such a conference might come a permanent liaison between these experts and our graduate students and us whereby we might depend upon their help in setting up research of our own. A major eastern university employs a full-time research director who does nothing else but serve this function for all concerned with carrying on research.

Of special interest to all of us is the summary and evaluation of research in composition about to be published by a Council committee, chaired by Richard Braddock of the Department of Rhetoric at the University of Iowa. It opens with a section setting forth the flaws common to studies excluded from the report, followed by a list of practices used in experiments which were considered acceptable.[2] The committee hopes the report may be useful as a guide for those engaging hereafter in studies of the teaching of composition.

Back of research are always a questioning attitude toward glib generalizations on how best to teach various elements of the English program and a constant searching for problems which need to be studied next. The habit of

---

[1] See *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1961), and the report of the NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum, *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963).

[2] Richard Braddock *et al.*, *Research in Written Composition* (Champaign, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963).

questioning can be instilled in students very early in their preparation for teaching. For example, some years ago a book on the teaching of reading reproduced a letter from Sir Winston Churchill to the king of England concerning who should succeed him as prime minister if he should be killed on a projected visit to France. The letter contained thirteen adverbial clauses. "No one can read this letter intelligently," said the author, "unless he can pick out these adverbial clauses and explain their function in the sentence."

Nothing could be easier than to test the validity of that statement. A graduate student drew up both a reading test and a grammar test based on the letter. Eventually, the passage became one of many tested in her doctoral study involving tenth grade students from widely separated sections of the United States. The letter proved to be the easiest reading item in the entire study and the most difficult one in grammar. It was Dr. Ingrid Strom, our hard-working local chairman of this conference, who made the study.

Some months ago, I visited with a graduate student from a distant university, who told me she had completed her course work for the Ph.D. and planned to devote the spring term to her dissertation. "I think I will *write* on creativity," she said. If doctoral theses in the teaching of English are allowed to degenerate into glorified term papers, there will be no impetus for the research necessary to intelligent teaching of English methods.

### Who Should Teach Methods?

There has been some discussion in various sections of the conference concerning which department of a college or university should offer the course in English methods. To me this question seems relatively immaterial though it may be of interest to note that a resolution passed jointly by the College Section of the National Council of Teachers of English and the Conference on College Composition and Communication in 1962 recommended that "the course in methods of teaching English, credited as work in education and taught by a qualified teacher accepted by the departments of English and education, be an integral part of the professional sequence of the English major, and be included among the requirements for certification of English teachers."[3]

What matters most, it seems to me, is that we should keep the qualifications for the position high.

1. The person offering the course in English methods should be more thoroughly prepared in English than the English majors he is teaching. Although this seems a modest proposal, the requirement is not always adhered to in the colleges of this country.

2. He should have qualified both in English and in professional education for the certificate for which he is preparing his students.

3. He should have taught English in high school a goodly number of years so that he may understand thoroughly the problems of prospective teachers.

4. Since he is the college or university's contact man or woman with the public schools, he should have kept close to those who are teaching in the high

[3] Copies are available from the office of the National Council of Teachers of English, 508 South Sixth Street, Champaign, Illinois.

schools of his state and should have attended their state and local meetings regularly. In short, he should be intimately related to the teaching of English in the high schools which his students will serve.

At the University of Minnesota, we have found especially helpful for both college and high school instructors through the years an annual campus conference on the problems of teaching English in secondary schools. A committee, chosen by the instructor in English methods and called by the dean of education, prepares the program. This committee is composed of representative members of the academic departments of English in literature, composition, and linguistics and professors of speech, journalism, and dramatics, the head of the department of English in the University High School, and a professor of curriculum and one in reading. Off-campus representatives include the presidents of the Minneapolis and St. Paul English clubs in each of the academic areas mentioned above and the state presidents of similar organizations, state and Twin City supervisors in these areas, three representatives of small town English departments, and the university, state, and Twin City school library associations. These committee members talk over together the problems facing teachers of English at the moment, plan the conference, and suggest speakers. After that, the chairman, who is the instructor in English methods, with any needed assistance from campus members of the committee, invites the speakers and arranges for meetings and meals. The dean of education sends out the invitations to teachers of the state and pays the bills. Nothing else we have done throughout the years has given both campus and off-campus teachers so great a sense of mutual need and mutual helpfulness as this conference.

### Relation to Methods of Other Courses

We have covered fairly well in the last two days the relations between the methods course and the offerings of the English department. It may be useful at a future meeting to consider the relationship of the course in English methods to what has preceded it in the program in education. The courses mentioned in the various sectional meetings have been Foundations of Education, including educational philosophy and the functions of secondary education in this country, the Psychology of Learning and of Adolescence, and General Principles of Teaching.

Surveys of students' evaluations of courses in education always place Student Teaching first in value and English Methods and Literature for Adolescents second. Literature for Adolescents is the only course which I have ever seen superseding methods in the rating of individual teachers except the experience in teaching. The courses in foundations, in child development, and in learning always rank lower on the scale of values. I wonder if this results because their relationship to methods and teaching is not made sufficiently clear to prospective teachers during their course in English methods. For example, in philosophy and in purpose the secondary schools of the United States differ markedly from those of most European countries. I remember vividly accompanying a small cousin of six to his secondary school in London, where he was to spend all his school years until he passed a final school-leaving examination or the matriculation examination for college. It was a handsome red brick build-

ing, over the gate of which was inscribed the name, Wilson's Grammar School for the Sons of Gentlemen. Around it was a high wall, also of red brick, on top of which were pieces of glass and nails so that the sons of gentlemen could not climb over to mingle with the rest of the population.

Some years after World War II, my sister and I were wandering in our old haunts in southeast London, when we came on a battered red brick building with a broken wall falling into the school yard. Over the gate, which was still upright, was a simple sign: Wilson's School. This is what two world wars did to British education. Thomas Mann, in a Phi Beta Kappa address in Berkeley in 1941, attributed the holocaust in Germany to the fact that her "doers" and her "thinkers" had been educated separately.[4] St. Augustine, the old capital of Spanish Florida, proudly displays to visitors the oldest school building built on this continent. Behind it is a "grove of educators," one from each country of the Western hemisphere. Who is it that represents the United States? Interestingly enough, it is Horace Mann, who gave up his law practice in Boston to stump the state of Massachusetts on behalf of a single school system for all the children of the nation. Baltimore already had its Benevolent Society for the Education of the Female Poor, and Philadelphia, its Society for the Establishment and Support of Charity Schools. Thanks to Horace Mann, we developed in this country a pattern of our own, adapted to the ideology and conditions of a new nation.

What does such a philosophy do to the range of individual differences in our classrooms and our method of dealing with them? Does the question have any connection with the methods course? Future teachers need to face this problem in specific relation to the teaching of English.

Jerome Bruner, in his thought-provoking book on *The Process of Education*, deals not only with "the structure of the subject" but with the processes of growth in children. "One must respect the ways of thought of the growing child," he says, and likewise the ways of feeling and of imagining. One must clarify for him the personal significance of what he is learning. Only in this way will he be led to assume responsibility for the pursuit of new knowledge. We as teachers, he believes, must *pursue excellence while honoring the diversity of talents.*[5] Such principles have been the subject of study for many years. The prospective teacher has heard much about them in the courses which precede English methods. It is the business of the methods course to relate them all to the improved teaching of English. Ways of organizing the program so as to bridge this gap between educational philosophy, principles of learning, and the growth of children and young people and what is taught in English methods are being experimented with throughout the country. A group like ours has much to offer to the movement and much to learn from it. The stimulation of such meetings as this should help us on our way.

In some of the sectional meetings of this conference we have heard reports of William H. Evans's survey of programs of teacher education in English.[6]

---

[4] Thomas Mann, "Thought and Life," *The Key Reporter*, 6 (Autumn 1941), 1 and 5.

[5] Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 67-80.

His results show that in one-third of the 576 colleges or universities responding to his questionnaire, teachers of English graduate without a specific course in methods of teaching their major subject. I believe that a group such as ours should investigate this situation and speak out in relation to it.

All of the aspects of the preparation of teachers of English discussed at this conference are examined in Volume V of the Curriculum Series of the National Council of Teachers of English, which will be available before the San Francisco meeting of the Council next November. It will be called *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges.*[7]

Alfred Grommon of Stanford University and his co-workers at each level of our educational system have produced a book of which we may well be proud. It deals with the philosophical and practical problems of our specific task of preparing English teachers for American schools, bringing constantly to bear upon it the evidence of research already available in our field. What better preparation could we have for the next conference of this group to which we all look forward in 1964?

---

[6] Mimeographed report of the Committee on Secondary Methods Courses of the National Council of Teachers of English by William H. Evans, Associate Chairman—to be included in a forthcoming pamphlet of the Council called *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, in preparation).

[7] *Op. cit.*

# CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH EDUCATION

## Indiana University

## March 28-30, 1963

### First General Session

Presiding: Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University; General Chairman

Greetings: David H. Russell, University of California; President, NCTE

Announcements: Ingrid M. Strom, Local Chairman of Arrangements

Address:

Robert C. Pooley, University of Wisconsin

"The Scholarly and Professional Role of the Specialist in the Teaching of English"

### Second General Session

Symposium: The Methods Course

Moderator: Sister M. Sylvia, S.S.J., Mount Saint Joseph Teachers College

Discussants:

George H. Henry, University of Delaware

David Stryker, University of Florida

Joseph Mersand, Acting English Specialist in the U. S. Office of Education

### Third General Session

Presiding: James R. Squire, Executive Secretary, NCTE

Address:

David H. Russell, University of California

"Research: A Priority"

John C. Gerber, University of Iowa

"The Evaluation of the CEEB Institutes: A Preliminary Report"

### Fourth General Session

Symposium: Graduate Programs in English Education

Moderator: William E. Hoth, Wayne State University

Discussants:

Richard Meade, University of Virginia

Robert Shafer, Columbia University

Stanley B. Kegler, University of Minnesota

### Fifth General Session

Symposium: *Project English* Curriculum Centers and the NEA Projects

Moderator: J. N. Hook, Coordinator, *Project English*

Discussants:

Arno Jewett, NEA, Composition Project

Lois Josephs, Carnegie Institute of Technology

Stephen Dunning, Northwestern University

Silvy Kraus, University of Oregon

Frank Rice, University of Nebraska

Stanley Kegler, University of Minnesota

Marjorie Smiley, Hunter College

## Sixth General Session

Presiding: Dwight L. Burton

Reports from Each Discussion Group (10 minutes for each group)

Reactions: Dora V. Smith

## Seventh General Session

Presiding: Ingrid M. Strom, Indiana University

Address:

G. Robert Carlsen, University of Iowa

"The Future of English Education"

## Discussion Groups

General Consultant: Dora V. Smith, University of Minnesota (Emeritus)

*Group I, Section 1*

"Improving the Methods Course and Other Specialized Undergraduate Courses"

Chairman: William H. Evans, University of Illinois

Co-chairman: Thelma McAndless, Eastern Michigan University

Consultants:

Donald Emery, University of Washington
A. K. Stevens, University of Michigan
Wilfred Eberhart, The Ohio State University

Secretary: Agnes V. Boner, Montana State University

*Group I, Section 2*

"Improving the Methods Course and Other Specialized Undergraduate Courses"

Chairman: James E. Cochrane, State University of New York (Albany)

Co-chairman: Jean Sisk, Baltimore County Schools

Consultants:

Dorothy Whitted, Ohio Wesleyan University
Virginia Burke, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Alfred Crabb, Jr., University of Kentucky

Secretary: Jean Sisk, Baltimore Public Schools

*Group II*

"Conducting and Supervising Research"

Chairman: Margaret J. Early, Syracuse University

Co-chairman: John S. Simmons, Florida State University

Consultants:

Oscar M. Haugh, University of Kansas
John Brownell, Claremont Graduate School
Lou LaBrant, Dillard University

Secretary: Royal Morsey, Ball State Teachers College

*Group III*

"Improving Liaison Between Departments of English and Departments, Schools, or Colleges of Education"

Chairman: Foster B. Gresham, Longwood College

Co-chairman: Dorothy Moulton, Bowling Green State University

Consultants:
John R. Searles, University of Wisconsin
Roy Ludtke, University of Colorado
Dorothy Miller, University of Pittsburgh
Secretary: Maurice Y. Brown, Florida A & M University

*Group IV*

"Designing Graduate Programs in English Education"

Chairman: M. Agnella Gunn, Boston University
Co-chairman: Mark A. Neville, Indiana State College (Terre Haute)
Consultants:
Louise M. Rosenblatt, New York University
Paul Scheid, Auburn University
Robert Shafer, Columbia University
Secretary: Robert Shafer, Columbia University

*Group V*

"Developing Programs to Prepare Junior High School English Teachers"

Chairman: Marie D. Bryan, University of Maryland
Co-chairman: Arnold Lazarus, Purdue University
Consultants:
Geneva Hanna, University of Texas
Lizette Van Gelder, University of Kentucky
Howard Vander Beek, State College of Iowa
Secretary: A. Stephen Dunning, Northwestern University

*Group VI*

"Developing Programs in Small Colleges for the Preparation of English Teachers"

Chairman: Albert W. Vogel, Hood College
Co-chairman: Charles Weingartner, State University College (New Paltz)
Consultants:
Loren Grissom, Northeast Missouri Teachers College
Eugene Slaughter, Southeastern State College, Oklahoma
Gertrude Stearns, Plymouth Teachers College
Secretary: Virginia Allwin, Arizona State College

*Informal Question-and-Answer Sessions with:*

James R. Squire, NCTE
Floyd Rinker, Commission on English
J. N. Hook, *Project English*